HUNGARY

AFTER A THOUSAND YEARS

by

Imre Josika-Herczeg

Edited by Andrew L. Simon

Originally published in 1936 by American Hungarian Daily, Inc. New York, NY and printed in the United States by J.J. Little and Ives Company, New York

ISBN 0-9665734-5-5

Library of Congress Card Number: 00-101927

Published by Simon Publications, P.O. Box 321, Safety Harbor, FL 34695

Printed by Lightning Print, Inc. La Vergne, TN 37086

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction by Andrew L. Simon

This book is quite unique. It was published a long time ago, in 1934. Written by a Hungarian immigrant, published in New York by a local Hungarian language newspaper, it was probably sold to the paper's subscribers, not to bookstores and libraries. Consequently it has gone entirely unnoticed by those with professional interest in the political history of Hungary. It is a pity, because it contains a great deal of information about Hungary that are scarcely touched in other texts. The treatment of the topic is remarkably untainted by the vicious anti-Hungarian propaganda that appears in many similar books. It is written in the friendly spirit that characterized American - Hungarian relations before World War I.

Before the first World War relations between the United States and Hungary were consistently warm. Only three foreigners were invited to address the U. S. Congress before 1913: The revolutionary hero Marquis de LaFayette, the leader of Hungary's 1848 revolution Louis Kossuth and Hungarian statesman Count Albert Apponyi. A single Frenchman and two Hungarians in a period of 137 years. The list of Hungarian contributions to America is a lengthy one[1]. Hungarians fought in the Revolutionary War as well as in America's Civil War, on the Northern side. From 1832 on there were regular scientific exchanges between the American and Hungarian scientific academies, Ágoston Haraszthy initiated California's wine industry, many Hungarians helped to establish the film industry, Hungarian scientist, John von Neumann, Edward Teller, Leo Szilard, Eugene Wigner, John Kemeny, Theodore von Karman and many others spearheaded research in atomic energy, aeronautics, computers and many other fields in the United States. Almost a million and a half Hungarian immigrants helped to build America's industrial might.

The personal story of the author, Imre Jósika-Herczeg is elusive. He held two doctorates, one from the University of Budapest, another from the University of Kolozsvár. Apparently, he had a diplomatic background in the

1 See Simon, Andrew L.: Made in Hungary, Hungarian Contributions to Universal Culture, ISBN 0-9665734-2-0

Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. His considerable knowledge of the secret political machinations of European governments that led up to the first World War is revealed in the text. He served as an officer in the Hungarian cavalry on the Russian front between 1914 and 1917. In 1917 Jósika-Herczeg was sent to Berlin as a Military Attaché representing the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, with the secret assignment to counteract anti-Monarchy propaganda that was increasingly virulent in German newspapers. After the war he resided in New York among quite affluent circumstances. In 1926 he could even afford a round-the-world trip. Little is known about his personal life, except that he was involved in ethnic Hungarian activities. His personal friendship with the great Hungarian statesman, Albert Apponyi led to the latter's official invitation to America in 1923, was a significant event at the time in Hungarian-American relations.

In 1934, when this book was written, Hungarians were still hopeful that eventually the disastrous Trianon Treaty ending WWI will be revised and, at last, justice will prevail. The book is a true mirror of this political naïvité prevalent in Hungary at the time. No one, not even in a delirious nightmare, would have guessed that ten years later Hungary would be first occupied by Hitler's Germany and then overrun by the Soviet Red Army. The rape and destruction of the country was followed by a Soviet-sponsored Communist takeover that did not end for almost a half of a century.

The image of Hungary in America has been badly tarnished during the 20th century by three discrete causes:

A. Functionaries of the 1919 Bolshevik regime in Hungary who escaped to the United States, other Western countries as well as to the Soviet Union exerted a great deal of effort to spread ill will against their former homeland.

B. The Little Entente—Czechoslovakia, Romania and Yugoslavia—were ceaseless in their anti-Hungarian propaganda from WWI. After all, they were created from, or—in the case of Romania—hugely enlarged by historically Hungarian territories, and they did everything to pre-empt Hungary's futile efforts to peacefully revise the Trianon Treaty.

C. For the Soviet-installed Communist rulers of Hungary condemning the previous regime was doctrinal self-justification. From 1945 on, Hungary's Muscovite Communist historians concocted expressions about the earlier

regime like "institutional terror of the fascist dictatorship", in their attempt to denigrate the earlier era, with total disregard of the truth.

In the 1920 to 1945 period, often referred to as the "Horthy Era", Hungary was a constitutional parliamentary democracy where any political party, with the singular exception of Communists, were free to organize. In fact 10 to 12 political parties of every political creed gained seats in the Parliament. According to the 1919 election laws, some 75 percent of the adult population had the right to vote. The freedom of the press was comparable to that in any democratic Western country. A great variety of newspapers with a broad spectrum of political persuasion were published without any censorship: in 1938 there were a total of 376 periodicals of political nature in Hungary[2], representing a wide range of views. Regent Horthy's political power was quite limited. It certainly did not exceed that of an elected president of any of Europe's democracies. But one rarely learn these facts from even recently written history books. What one finds appears like a mantra: "In the White Terror 5 thousand people were executed, 70 thousand were imprisoned and 100 thousand left the country." Utter nonsense!

The three-pronged anti-Hungary propaganda was described in detail by no less than Communist Hungary's ambassador to West Germany in the 1980's, István Horváth—serving under dictator János Kádár—who wrote:

"The negative image of Hungary—beyond the actual facts—have partly caused by the campaigns of propaganda generated by Hungary's emigrants from the 1918 'chrysanthemum' revolution and the 1919 proletarian dictatorship continued for decades in the West (after the collapse of the soviet republic many thousand operated in the West, mainly in Austria and France) and in the Soviet Union. They incessantly elaborated about Horthy-fascism, anti-Semitism, bloody counter-revolution, chauvinism, reaction and oppression. These notions, asserted up by Hungarian emigrants, were coming from the West as well as from the East and they still influence the Western public opinion in regard to the regime in Hungary between the two World Wars. In addition to the purposefully created negative image of

2 Ignac Romsich: The character of the Horthy Era; Budapest: *Magyar Nemzet,* March 3, 2000.

Hungary, the post-war Communist party propaganda endeavored to rewrite history. Scores of politicians, newspapermen and historians feverishly worked to depict 'counter-revolutionary' Hungary as criminal in its attitude and behavior, in order to create the ideology of the 'guilty nation', and to indoctrinate the Hungarians toward an 'indelible guilty conscience'. The purposeful over-emphasis by the Communist party of Hungary's 'fascist-infestation' came also handy to stress the democratic re-education that was demanded in the Yalta Doctrine, and to offer itself as the best qualified instructor for the job." [3]

A declaration like this, coming from a former Hungarian Communist diplomat, can shed light on Hungary's "image problem" far better than scores of self-serving explanations by anti-Communist Hungarians at home or abroad. But from the beginning, Hungary between the two world wars did very little to counteract the malicious barrage of lies directed against her. When Hungary's long time prime minister, Stephen Bethlen was asked why Hungary never responded to the virulent anti-Hungarian propaganda in the West, he replied: "We did not have the money for those kind of things".

In fact, in the light of Hungary's grievous losses at the end of World War I, the country was well on its way to recovery economically as well as culturally. After hundreds of years of Habsburg domination, the country finally enjoyed full political independence. Even though surrounded by hostile neighbors, it enjoyed a vibrant cultural life. Much of this affected America as well. For example, Hungarian film imports to the United States in 1937 was fourth behind English, French and German films according to *Variety*, a trade paper. Twenty-nine Hungarian plays opened on Broadway between 1923 and 1933. Between 1908 and 1940 fifty-seven plays were performed on American stage written by Hungarian writers. In one particular case, Ferenc Molnár's plays totaled 2,148 first run performances. This exuberant display of cultural vigor is not an indication of brutal political oppression by an antiquated feudal regime in a country.

3 Horvath, I. & I. Nemeth: And the Walls Collapse - Hungary and the German Unity (1945-1990), Budapest: Magveto, 1999 (in Hungarian, also published in German)

After 80 years of incessant lies and misrepresentations, Jósika-Herczeg's long lost and now rediscovered book about Hungary is like a blast of fresh air. It is entirely free of the political and propagandistic stench that has gathered on Hungary's history during the 20th century. Even though over six decades passed since the original publication of this book, it is still fresh, lucid, informative and full of surprising details. In re-editing the book, some dated materials were excluded, such as the discussion of long forgotten Hungarian professors working in the United States at the time. The 'story' written by the Author ends in the early 1930's. There were no attempts to bring the book up to date. Rather, some material is included as an appendix that help elucidate Hungary's history from the time of Josika-Herczeg. The work will serve as a useful source book for historians and laymen interested in a non-partisan description of Hungary's history, *after a thousand years.*

Quite contrary to the wide-spread propaganda, according to British and American diplomats and political writers familiar with the matter, Hungary's political life has not shown any trace of the alleged political oppression so vehemently claimed by the Communist propagandists. Excerpts of contemporary reports about Hungary written by knowledgeable British and American observers between 1919 and 1947 are attached in the Appendix. As the reader shall conclude, these unbiased descriptions of pre-WW2 Hungary do not give credence to the well entrenched Bolshevik propaganda.

A copy of Josika-Herczeg's book—perhaps one of the very few remaining copies—was made available by Dr. George Bozoki, a Hungarian research physicist formerly of Brookhaven National Laboratory. His generosity in loaning the book for the purpose of digitizing is sincerely appreciated.

Andrew L. Simon, May, 2000.

Preface by Count Albert Apponyi

This book on Hungary is written by a Hungarian patriot who knows his subject as few know it, a man whose knowledge is equalled only by his affection. And the fact of having spent many years in English-speaking countries enables him to take a broad view of Hungarian facts and to look upon them in their connection with world issues. More especially is he enabled to put in the clearest light those aspects of Hungarian affairs which appeal to the Western mind, those aspects in which the citizens of Great Britain and of the far-away republic of America are likely to be interested. I know, therefore, that it is a very useful book and I very warmly recommend it to public attention, not only because the author is a highly valued friend of mine, but because of its intrinsic value as a source of information on a subject which deserves more attention than it generally gets.

Does it really deserve that attention? Is it possible that I am myself misled by patriotic feelings when recommending the book, just as the author may have been when writing it?

I think not. I think we are both right. The fate of our Hungarian people is not merely a matter of sentiment for ourselves; it is part of the human evolution as represented by the white race, and more especially by its most progressive type, the Western-European, from which all modern culture emanates.

Twice has Hungary saved Western Europe from mortal danger by an unexampled display of military heroism: in the thirteenth century, when the Mongols threatened its destruction but were stopped by Hungarian valour, and in that epoch when, from the beginning of the fifteenth to the middle of the sixteenth century, the Turkish onslaught was successfully resisted by our forefathers in one continuous struggle. It was the battle of Western civilization against Eastern barbarism. Hungary had to fight it almost unassisted. When she did ultimately break down, in the first half of the sixteenth century, the Turkish power was so far exhausted that Western Europe remained safe.

But this is not all. In those degrees and forms for which each epoch was ripe (and in this respect mostly in advance of the general standard), the Hungarian people always enjoyed political liberty and stood for that liberty against the various attempts at arbitrary power. All over the European continent the medieval constitutions, such as they were, broke down after the great

renaissance, in the sixteenth century, of ancient Greco-Roman art and of that Roman law in its Byzantine form which favoured the uncontrolled power of princes. Hungary alone succeeded in preserving in the most harassing circumstances the continuity of her ancient constitution—a constitution not ideal, perhaps, if measured by the standards of today, but representing at that time the maximum of people's rights existing in constitutional political organizations. At each stage, with the ripeness of time, further democratic evolution was effected in a procession strictly legal, the result of constant growth. This bears testimony to the unconquerable vigour and to the glorious predestination of our race.

Should I mention the contribution of this same race to the mental treasury of mankind? To Science, Art, Literature, to the liberal political evolution of mankind? It does not lie 'within the scope of a preface to go into details, the reader will find them in the book itself. My task is only to prepare his mind for the matter he will find herein. I am sure he will feel enriched after its perusal; he will have won additional knowledge of humanity by searching into the life of one of its most peculiar and least-known branches.

Yes, humanity as a whole would certainly feel the loss of our small race; humanity is none the better for the wounds and the temporary state of weakness recently inflicted upon it.

Every inch of ground that we lose is lost for the higher type of Western culture. The fulfillment of our hopes, the success of our new struggles for revision and reconstruction, is therefore of importance, not to us only, but to the equilibrium and progress of mankind as a whole. Whoever assists us towards the peaceful reconquest of a position adequate to our world renown serves the cause of healthy human evolution as well as of justice.

ALBERT APPONYI

Budapest

1. HUNGARY IN 1934 AS SEEN BY THE TRAVELLER

It is broad daylight and the Bucharest express, which left the Rumanian capital yesterday, arrives at the Hungarian frontier. At a small village station (which now serves as an important frontier post), the passports are being examined by armed Rumanian guards; only after a slow and tedious passage through the customs house is the train surrendered to the personnel of the Hungarian railways. Within fifteen minutes the atmosphere surrounding the passengers of the Bucharest-Budapest express undergoes a peculiar change. Now, instead of the crude Rumanian conductor with a stained uniform and an insatiable "tip-hunger," a neat, pleasant man enters your compartment and asks to see your ticket; now the train proceeds according to the time-table, running smoothly from station to station without angry encounters between passengers and armed guards. The table-cloths in the dining car are snow-white; the head waiter understands German and French as well as Hungarian. You are no longer in the Balkans but in Central Europe. You recognize at once the contrast between East and West. Indolence, corruption and disorder have been replaced by the cleanliness, organization and efficiency of Western civilization.

The train is speeding through apparently endless meadows of lowlands: to the right and left of you stretch symmetrical fields of crops. From the window of your compartment you see a blending of green and yellow, each colour being occasionally emphasized by a sudden leaf-green pasturage or a golden wheat field. Here and there you catch glimpses of harvesting machines or Ford tractors that move like toys in the distance. Were it not for the absence of advertising posters, you might imagine that you were travelling through the vast flat lands of Texas. For miles and miles there is neither a forest nor a grove; not even a low tree breaks the contour of the level expanse. The monotony of the lowland is neither romantic nor picturesque. When the train passes through stations you look vainly for the multi-coloured costumes of the natives. loitering on the platform there are a few men in long white drawers and some peasant women wearing many-coloured skirts, but the dominating colour is a simple black of the garb worn by farmers in any Western European country.

You lean back in the comfortable plush seat, vaguely disturbed by a feeling of disappointment. Having heard glowing accounts of Hungary, you were prepared to see magnificently-attired Magyar noblemen riding spirited horses, and caravans of exotic gypsies wandering over the highways. You had been led to imagine a land of colour and romance. After such reports you behold this sober country of peasant folk working industriously in the fields. Had you, however, crossed the Hungarian border from the Western side, with the expectation of seeing the blazing pageant of the Orient, your disappointment would not have been less keen.

Now your attention and interest are arrested by your fellow-passengers. They speak in Hungarian, a melodious language that lacks all guttural intonations. The men speak slowly and quietly, without abrupt ejaculations and over-emphasis of particular words. They are provincials, land-owners, merchants, or lawyers. You wonder at the sadness of their faces and the mutual sympathy that seems to exist among them; any display of emotion is in direct contrast to the pride and reserve which are among their dominant characteristics. Though you do not understand their talk, you feel intuitively that their remarks are touched with the pathos of deep personal struggles.

Were you able to understand the language, you would hear an example of typical conversation in present-day Hungary. The subject remains the same, with only a slight variation of detail. It consists of short statements such as these: “Michael's land was taken away by the Rumanians. He didn’t get a penny for it. He is fifty-six and a beggar.” “John is coming to Budapest from Nagyvárad. He lost his job because he is a Hungarian. Poor fellow, what will he do now?” “Steve has gone to America. The Czechs worried him so much and he couldn’t bear the strain; it was too much for him.

He was forced to send his two children to the Czech school. Of course they didn't understand a word of what was taught there. Steve says that even if he is not allowed to remain a Magyar he wants to see his children imbued with Anglo-Saxon culture rather than lowered to the educational level of the Czechs.” “Heard about the riots in Kolozsvár? I'm nervous about Nicholas. His shop was twice sacked by the Rumanians. One more attack and he'll be finished.” Also in the train you see a fine-looking young man in rags, who, you learn, escaped by desertion from the cruelties of the Rumanian officials. He is only one of the Hungarians who, having been allotted to Rumania, has been forced to serve in the Rumanian army. “I am not the only one who deserted,”

he explains. These abrupt sentences give expression to isolated human sufferings that are all intrinsically bound up with the tragedy of Hungary.

Of all this you understand little. Weary now from the long journey you lounge in your seat, glancing without concern through the window, or you turn to your guide-book for information about the Hungarian capital. Budapest is a city of one million inhabitants, comparable in size to Manchester in England or Cleveland in America. After the uniformity of the province and the monotony of the Hungarian lowland which held no appeal for your imagination, you cherish the hope that this city will reveal to you the enchanting romance of the Hungarian nation.

It is sundown when you arrive in Budapest. As you step out to the balcony of your room facing the Danube you feel a breath of that atmosphere which you had sought vainly in the lowlands. You have heard of the "beautiful position" of the Hungarian capital, but the vista unfolding itself before your eyes surpasses anything that you have imagined. Beyond the river, spanned by several bridges of marvellous grace, rises a chain of hills and mountains which tower above the darkening blue of the Danube. The peaks are crowned with great buildings that reflect in their interesting variety the evolution of architecture. Opposite you stands a Renaissance palace of magnificent proportions that must command a view of the entire city. It is the Royal Palace, the abode of the Kings of Hungary. Terraced lawns, comparable to the hanging gardens of Queen Semiramis, extend to the embankment of the river. To the right of the palace a bastion-like structure girdles the mountain, the white stones of its ramparts standing out brilliantly against the background of lawn and trees; its vaults and round turrets are in the Romanesque style of the thirteenth century. High on a hill nearby rises the slender tower of a Gothic cathedral. Further to the right you see a peculiar Moorish structure, the grave of a Moslem cleric, Gul-Baba, the friend of the roses, who lived and died here about three hundred years ago. The view to the left is obstructed by a rocky mountain with a citadel on the summit; to one side of this stands a monument of a priest holding a cross in his right hand, like a sign of warning to the dwellers of the metropolis.

This view before you is a blending of architectural skill and natural beauty. Now in the lustre of the setting sun the panorama glows richly: roofs, pinnacles, cupolas and domes are touched with a delicate radiance; the dewy

green of mountains and gardens merges softly into the mild blue of the Danube.

For a moment you are dazzled by this profusion of beauty. Does this harmony of colour not suggest the Orient? Is this extraordinary tableau a reproduction of Eastern splendour placed in a sober Western environment? The old-world civilization is not yet marred by the far-reaching influence of standardization. Above you, on the mountains of old Buda, the memories of eight centuries are quietly brooding. Reluctantly you are recalled to the present by the clashing harmonies of an American jazz-band in the hail below. With a newly-aroused interest you perceive this contrast, the first of many which the Hungarian capital will offer, and you straightway decide that Budapest is a city worthy of exploration.

Pest, the modern section of the city, occupying the left bank of the Danube, is young in spite of the amazing rapidity of its development. One hundred and fifty years ago Pest was a hamlet; a century ago it was a provincial village with all the characteristics of Oriental life. During the last sixty years the Hungarians have made supreme efforts to transform their capital into an Occidental metropolis; the same impulse drove the ancestors of the Magyars westward from the Mongolian steppes to the lowlands of Hungary. A mysterious longing for Western civilization manifested itself in the determination to rebuild Oriental Pest according to 'Western methods of city planning and architecture. On the opposite side of the river mountainous Buda, with its narrow streets, winding stairways and steep slopes, was unfavourable as a location for a great modern city; therefore the borders were extended and a new metropolis was developed on the flat land of Pest. With the passing of a few decades all traces of the old provincial town have vanished from this capital, whose broad avenues resemble in grace and dignity the boulevards of Paris. After a few hours of sightseeing you are convinced that the Hungarians have realized their long-cherished dream. You gaze marvelling at the public buildings, fashioned after the plan of new-Gothic architecture, the Renaissance palaces and basilicas in pure Roman style, the elaborate parks and imposing monuments, the theatres and concert halls. Pest is faultlessly Occidental, with not so much as one detail suggesting the proximity of the Balkans.

You soon discover that the life of Budapest is quite different from that of other Occidental cities. The Hungarian capital lies at the crossroads of the West and

the East, and is a meeting place for Orientals and Occidentals. At every step you see the Orient clad in the garments of the Occident. The East, thus Westernized, throbs in the life of the capital, and lingers still in the fiery blood of the Hungarians. This blending of efficiency and romance lends a unique atmosphere to the city; Budapest is a combination of an Oriental Paris and a Western Constantinople.

You cannot know France without first understanding Paris and the Parisian; so in Hungary you must understand Budapest and the Budapester. He is as different from the man of the province as an inhabitant of Chalons is from a man of Paris. You will hear that the Budapester is not a genuine Magyar; but, in spite of the scorn directed against him by the provincials and the landed gentry, you will feel that this Budapester is representative of modern and progressive Hungary. He has gained a certain shrewdness and wisdom from the sophistication of the Parisian boulevardier and an alertness from the flashing wit of the Viennese. But he has retained withal his imagination and the traditional habit of indulging his dreams. Your interest in this Oriental-Occidental has been captivated, and you wonder curiously about his life in the Hungarian capital.

Clerks, salesmen, cooks, lawyers, scholars, merchants, paupers, millionaires, all Budapesters indeed, spend the greater part of their lives in the gilded rooms of the typical Budapest establishment commonly called the coffee-house. There are coffee-houses everywhere in Europe, but the “continental” coffee-house resembles in no way the coffee-house of Budapest. The Budapester adopted the idea of the coffee-house from Paris and then moulded it according to his own requirements and tastes. The result is an organization that is unique throughout the whole world. The coffee-house of Western Europe is a place of amusement; you go to one in Paris or Berlin to have a drink or to spend a pleasant evening. In Budapest the coffee-house is a substitute for a club, a business place, a forum for politicians, a melting pot of public opinion; in short, it is a general office on the pavement and it is adapted to the social and business habits of the Budapester.

In Budapest there are about five hundred coffee-houses, all different in atmosphere and in the clientele which they serve. Every class of society, except the aristocracy which patronizes the clubs, has its own coffee-house. It is customary for the Budapester to call at “his” particular coffee-house two or three times during the day. The Budapester is familiar with the various types

of coffee-houses and the professions and habits of their clients. If a man patronizes the Café Szeged his reputation is doubtful; if he frequents the Café Kohn he is an orthodox Jew; if he goes to the "Abbazia" he is a radical, and if he sits in the "Spolarits" he is marked as a reactionary. Officers favour the "Belvárosi," artists the "Japan," writers the "Palermo," domestic servants the "Esö," a small set of aristocrats the "Magyar Világ," and gypsy musicians the "Báthory"; judges of the Supreme Court support the "Curia," stock brokers the "Upor," deputies of opposite parties the "Országház," government supporters the "Hungaria," Jewish rabbis the "Kovács," deaf mutes the "Edison," and lumber merchants the "Venice," nicknamed, at times when business is slack, "Insolvenice"!

The Budapester may direct his entire life from the rooms of his particular coffee-house. He conducts business and social affairs free of charge by means of a telephone supplied by the establishment; he has appointments with customers; he meets his friends and his enemies; he begins and concludes liaisons; he reads the newspapers and current magazines which are provided for his use, and writes his letters on stationery belonging to the establishment; he plays card games and in the evening orders the gypsies to play his favourite songs. Here he may find all the men and women whose services are essential to him during a lifetime; the midwife who facilitates his appearance in the world, the teacher who imparts the wisdom of learning, the girl whom he will marry, and the other girl with whom he flirts; a lawyer, a business partner, a physician, a priest, and an undertaker are at hand to fulfill all demands.

In this seemingly frivolous life there lies a profound purpose that explains modern Hungary. The country and its capital developed too rapidly during recent decades for the rise of wealth to keep pace with the increasing ambition of the Budapester. He had the interests of a cosmopolitan and was anxious to bring culture, comfort and luxury into his life. Thus the coffee-house became the foundation of a poor but progressive country. The coffee-house was a substitute; but it became in the course of its development a powerful stimulus to unbiased public opinion. The Berliner subscribes to one newspaper, and therefore limits his knowledge of current events to the judgments expressed in one editorial column. The Budapester reads ten newspapers each day, and from comparison and discussion of the viewpoints taken by various editors he formulates his own opinion. At the conclusion of the war it was unnecessary for Count Tisza, the martyred Premier, to tell the Budapester that "we had lost the war"; the Eudapester knew it already and had accepted the official

assurances regarding the prospective victory with a significant silence and a shrug of his shoulders. This gay coffee-house patron, who spends hours around the marble-topped tables chatting so amiably and so wisely, is an excellent worker with an organized mind; he is a creator of constructive plans, the founder of Budapest and the new Hungary. After the compromise with Austria in 1867 it was the undaunted Budapester, with his intelligence, vitality and tenacity of spirit, who reorganized the slumbering forces of the Hungarian nation; and he performed the miracle, by means of some magic rod, of transforming backward, languid, Oriental Hungary into a modern country. It was he, this nameless embodiment of national strength, who accomplished wonders on the flat land of Pest, who planned and put into execution a modern transportation system, and who encouraged trade and industry; it was the Budapester who gave an impetus to business and who approached national problems according to the dictates of reason and common sense. He roused the power and energy which he drew from the province and the Hungarian soil to action and progress. The Budapester of today still resembles the traditional Magyar farmer or labourer; but within him is now stirring a national consciousness and a desire for world cooperation. He and his brother in the province have pride and patriotism; but the pride of the modern Budapester urges him steadily along the path of achievement and his patriotism inspires him with lofty national ideals. To be sure, he sits in the Budapest coffee-house instead of on the porch of his family house; but now he is pondering over new ideas in order to organize the course of reconstruction with the utmost economy, and to utilize the dormant energy of the provinces. The modern Budapester holds aloft the banners of the steady and victorious progress of Hungary.

Moreover, the gradual disappearance of Oriental influence from the Hungarian capital and the transformation of that city into a Western metropolis are partly attributable to the Budapester. He knows the Orient well and “sees through” the picturesqueness which is merely a veil drawn over corruption, idleness and deterioration. This dread of the East is a singular attitude for an Easterner to hold. Therefore the development of Budapest under Western influences during the past decades has symbolic significance for the Magyars. The same predisposition' prompted the Magyars to discard their Asiatic religion in favour of Christianity. Later they accepted the Habsburgs as rulers rather than forfeit their individuality to the Turks. In recent years they established a spiritual defense to check the storm of jingo nationalism that swept through the country.

It was said at one time that France was divided into progressive revolutionary and militaristic reactionary factions. This statement could be made of Hungary; there is a lethargic provincial Hungary that Is counterbalanced by striving progressive Hungary. Between the two an eternal battle is waged for supremacy. Whatever the political results of this struggle may have been, Budapest has never yielded the spiritual leadership to the province. The authority of the city has stood firm; it has endured all reproach with quiet good humour and has continued to control the temper of progress for the ultimate benefit of the Hungarian nation.

You need not go far in quest of the Hungary of yesterday. From your hotel in Pest, which stands on the right of the Danube, it is but a short walk over the chain bridge to Buda, the older section of the city, which has been the seat of the Hungarian kings for a thousand years. Physically, the borough of Buda is even more closely connected with Pest than Lambeth is with Westminster or Manhattan is with Brooklyn; but this ancient city, cherishing past memories and traditions, remains aloof from the efficient business world and cosmopolitan life of Pest. The atmosphere of narrow streets and dignified houses lends a certain silence and aristocratic reserve to the older section of the city. In dress the burghers follow the fashions of twenty-five years ago. They assume an attitude of independence as they walk about the streets like so many animated illustrations from an old book. They prefer the tranquillity of their own customs to the gaiety of Pest. However, their fellow-citizens in Pest like to “come over” to Buda occasionally to spend a quiet evening in the garden of an old-fashioned restaurant.

Farther away on the more distant slope of Castle Mountain, the burghers who are descendants of German stock continue the cultivation of the manual arts; this folk has resigned itself to bitter acceptance of the victorious era that flourishes in Pest. But while the citizens of Pest spend their spring evenings and Sunday afternoons in orgies of fiery gypsy music and blatant jazz, the burghers quietly follow the traditions of their ancestors by playing quaint melodies to the music of zithers.

Pest, which encourages the advance of building, trading, and manufacturing, is already closing in upon the last remnant of ancient Hungary. To the left and right of Castle Mountain, on the slopes that belong to Buda, modern apartment-houses with “all improvements” are being erected. The business-man of Pest, who sponsors the progress of the new Hungary, is

directing this development which threatens to destroy the privacy and the exclusiveness of ancient Buda.

If you talk to these amiable builders of modern Hungary, you will discover a carefully concealed pathos which has been deepened by the memories of the last fourteen years. You detect a bitterness beneath their witty pleasantries. The nonchalance of pre-war days has vanished to give place to a mature seriousness. National catastrophes and individual tragedies have the same significance for these people; it is not only because of the crushing blow dealt so cruelly to their pride and ambition; it is not only because they have suffered unspeakable humiliation and defeat; but because of the unintelligible, deplorable consequences of the war, the dismemberment of the thousand-year-old Hungary. .

Inseparable from the march of historic events are the sorrows of individuals. Millions fell in the war, hundreds of thousands returned crippled, and thousands were killed in the days of revolution and counter-revolution. All this agony without any reason or necessity! Why did people go through this Inferno? They were in the midst of an unprecedented industrial and financial revival; they had nothing to gain from a conflict of nations. The death of Archduke Francis Ferdinand, who fell in Sarajevo, could have had no evil influence whatever upon their fortunes, since he was notorious as the arch-enemy of the Magyars. These people were plunged into war because they had no choice. There was no general franchise in Hungary before the war, and affairs of foreign policy rested upon a *terra incognita*, even to the members of the intelligentsia. The Hungarians were surprised by the war and dazed by the debâcle of its conclusion. Finally by the Peace Treaty they were paralyzed. There is not one Hungarian who did not suffer, during or after the war, personal losses which cannot be replaced. Fortunes were annihilated, savings of a lifetime became valueless, and the business of making a living became a thousand times more difficult. Every second man whom you meet in Budapest has adopted a new form of work, since his original vocation could no longer support him. Lawyers are becoming salesmen; teachers and scholars turn into common labourers; judges keep stores, and physicians supply music in cabarets; high generals are considered fortunate to be the owners of cigar shops! If you ask the reason for these radical changes, the answer will always be simply, “Sir, the country has become two-thirds smaller.”

Business is necessarily slack. A never-ending stream of refugees is pouring into this smaller Hungary. These people, having been expelled by the Czechs or Rumanians, come with the hope of finding a livelihood within the narrowed borders of a crippled country. The lowlands is powerless to export its agricultural products because its neighbours are disinclined to see Hungary flourish.

Hungarian books, newspapers, and notes are barred from the Magyars in the succession states. Even the work of Hungarian classicists is held back as "propaganda" by the victors.

Is there no reparation for the conditions in this country? Ask the Hungarian, and he will give the only possible reply, "Nothing, we shall wait. . . . Aye—we shall wait."

The enigmatic smile that accompanies this statement does not imply that the Budapester is brooding over revenge or a new war. He is tired of strife and bloodshed and proceeds quite practically to deal with the immense national problems which he considers it his immediate duty to solve. He does not believe in the new national levy and shrinks from the futile and irresponsible irredentism of a few jingoes. But there are two beliefs which he holds to unwaveringly. First, he has faith in the cultural superiority of his race over that of neighbouring races; secondly, he realizes without question the impracticability of the present situation. It is inevitable that the present and future progress of neighbouring countries should be affected by declining economic conditions in Hungary. The Budapester has begun to plan and to calculate in an effort to create from the prevailing confusion a working system of living. "We shall wait," he says. "Time is working for us. We must retain and increase our cultural superiority, and apply our energy to the stupendous task of rebuilding and reconstructing this unfortunate country."

Often in the course of a thousand years progressive Hungarians have worked toward this same end. The history of Hungary is a repetition of catastrophe followed by reconstruction. In spite of bitter disillusionment, the countrymen of Hungary are sustained by a strong racial unity and are inspired always with a deathless dream of the National State of Hungary. The Hungarian nation, having passed through one thousand years of strife and quietude, is still singing the song of the morrow.

2. THE BEGINNINGS OF HUNGARY

INTRODUCTION

The thousand-year-old kingdom of pre-war Hungary had an area of 125,402 square miles—an area about 4,000 square miles larger than that of Great Britain and Ireland; it occupied 5l.8 per cent of the total area of the late Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

It is generally conceded by historians that pre-World War I Hungary was a perfect geographical unit. It was mostly land power, having before the Treaty of Trianon a seaboard of less than a hundred miles on the Adriatic. Its land frontiers were excellently defined by the natural boundaries of the Carpathians on the northwest, northeast and southeast, and on the south by the Danube. This mighty river flows by Regensburg, Passau and Dévény to pre-war Hungary, touching Pozsony (known now as Bratislava) and enters post-war Hungary at Komárom. It divides Budapest, the Hungarian capital, modern Pest on one bank and the ancient Buda on the other. This natural boundary continues south along the course of the Save and Unna Rivers, west along the Leitha and March Rivers, forming, before the Treaty of Trianon, a thousand-year-old natural frontier between Austria and Hungary.

THE ORIGIN OF THE HUNGARIANS

Those Magyar elements, later called Hungarians, which came originally from Asia and conquered Hungary some eleven hundred years ago, were intermixed with the Finn-Ugor and Turco races; and, according to anthropological research, were, at the time of the great Folk Wandering (the tribal migrations from the Far East toward the West), in character, morals, spirit, habits and mentality more like the nomad Turcos from Central Asia than their more truly racial brethren, the Finn-Ugors.

While the ancient language of the Magyar tribe contained many words of Turkish and Sanskrit-Turco origin, it is firmly established by etymological research that the ancient Magyar tongue was derived almost wholly from the language of the Finn-Ugor group. It is this language which has developed through many centuries into the present Hungarian tongue. However,

anthropologists have not yet determined to which of the many Finn-Ugor language groups Hungarian belongs.

We know that the blond Finn and the brown Central Asiatic Turco type, those with dolychocephalic skulls and oval faces, called by Professor Bencker the Ugor type, originated in the region between the Middle Volga River and the Jeniseis. The language and characteristics of those people were similar to those of the Caucasian race. Moreover, the Hungarians managed to retain both the language and characteristics. Although the Finns settled in the more northern parts of Europe, yet many words in their language have remained as evidence of that early brotherhood with the present Hungarian race.

The history of the great tribal migrations is for the most part veiled, but it is known that about 1500 B.C. a race resembling the Hungarians conquered the territory known today as the great plain of the Kirgiz People, between the Ural and Altai Mountains and south from the Jaxartes, Aral and Caspian Seas. Professors Fiók and Munkácsi have estimated the numbers of Hungarians living there at that time at 200,000. The onslaughts of stronger tribes drove these ancient Hungarians from the region of the Ural-Altai. After centuries of wanderings in the Far East, they took possession in 896 A.D. of the territory embracing pre-war Hungary.

The Hungarian tribes then entered the land, known afterward as Hungary, toward the end of the ninth century. They came as mounted warriors, the women travelling in the primitive carts in which they lived. They were divided into seven well-organized tribes, taking in 108 nationalities and comprising 20,000 warriors. (The Greek Emperor Leo says in his notes that the early ancestors of the Hungarians were mounted warriors and fought with swords and arrows which they used with great precision and remarkable quickness while on horseback.) This number was later increased by the addition of an eighth unit, that of the Kabars, their kinsfolk.

To analyze the Hungarian race from an anthropological point of view, most valuable information is obtained from the works of Professors Joseph Lenhossek and Aurel Török of the University of Budapest, and also from those of John Jankó, Vilibald Semayer, and Louis Bartucz. All agree that the Hungarian race is the product of several mixed types, changed, as science has shown to be the case, by the environment of the folk race. In Transylvania and in the Danubian valleys the skulls are long. It is interesting to note that the

heads found in the graves of the Magyars who came from the Far East and conquered what is now Hungary are longer and narrower than those of the present Hungarians. This appears to be proof of environmental influence. The hair of the Hungarian race is chestnut brown, while the eyes are yellowish brown, blue, greenish blue and black.

Dr. Hunfalvy, another Hungarian anthropological authority, writes that the general racial characteristics and the local peculiarities of the Magyars are due to the fact that Hungary was perhaps the most perfect self-contained geographical unit in Europe. Thus the idioms of the language and the accents differ very little in any part of the country. Characteristics of the Magyars are pride and dignified bearing and courage. They are highly temperamental and have keen aesthetic appreciation. One of the strongest Hungarian traits is love for the land.

RACES IN THE DANUBE BASIN BEFORE THE MAGYARS

Before the Hungarians crossed the Carpathian Mountains, the tribes along the upper part of the Danube were the Kelts; toward the south were the Pannonians, kinsmen to the Daciers. The great lowlands of Hungary were inhabited by the Jazygiers and Sarmaten. Later the German races of the Quaden and Markomannen in the Carpathian Mountains were the early inhabitants of that territory now occupied by Hungary.The Roman campaign against the Pannonians began under Augustus, and under Emperor Trajan, in 100 A.D., the powerful realm of the Dakós was dismembered and the provinces of Pannonia and Dacia built up. Under Roman rule Roman life in cities founded by the Romans was flourishing, all the rest of the people had been Romanized, and veteran soldiers of the old Romans received fortunes, lands and cities. From those Roman ages remains are still found in the neighbourhood of Budapest, called the Aquincum. This was the early City of Pannonia, from which pre-war Hungary is still called Pannonia by historians.

Then came the Goths, who defeated and destroyed Dacia about 270 A.D. Afterwards came the Huns from Asia, massacred and defeated the inhabitants and took possession of one part of that country. These wild horsemen were defeated later by the still stronger Germans under the Hun King, Attila the Terrible, “Scourge of God.” He ruled, at that time, the whole barbarian

world. After his death, the Huns were defeated by the Ostrogoths and Gepides. The Ostrogoths marched toward Italy, and the Longobards came to settle in the same territory. In 560 A.D. this race abandoned the soil of future Hungary and departed to Italy. The same land became once more the battleground between the stronger German races and the Avars who often attacked Byzantium, Italy and Germany. The Slav migrations started afterwards and came to rest in the land of Avars. It was the powerful armies of Charles the Great, and not the Slavs, which finally annihilated the great realm of the Avars. Their princes and chieftains became the vassals of Charles, who made a successful compact against the Slavs, lasting for about a century. Then Pannonia became again the battleground between the Slavs, the Bavarians and the Franks. In this struggle all the culture of the Roman cities perished, as did the fighting races. The rest of the Longobards, Avars and the Franks, under Emperor Arnulf, called the Hungarians for help. The Hungarians conquered the territories inhabited by the Slavs in 896 A.D. and they built up the national State, introducing Christianity, civilization and culture at the eastern gates of Western Europe. This movement was first described in history by "Anonymus," the secretary of King Béla of Hungary.

THE FIRST HUNGARIAN DYNASTY;

Kings of the House Árpád (870-1301)

The ancient Magyars or Hungarians, one of the oldest races of the world, migrated, as we have seen, from Asia, the cradle of mankind. The heathen ancestors of this sturdy race arrived in the early part of the ninth century at the Carpathian Mountains, the natural border of the thousand-year-old Hungary. They rested forty days at the historic city of Munkács and there the seven chieftains of the tribes laid down their future policies.

Árpád, the son of Álmos, the eldest of the seven chieftains, was the founder of the first Hungarian dynasty, which ruled for three centuries. He inherited supreme power over the tribes and chieftains and ruled as an absolute monarch. It was largely through his efforts that the Magyars gave up their nomadic existence and were willing to settle down in the fertile valleys of the Danube and Tisza.

His son Geiza it was who realized that his people would have to adapt themselves to the Christian faith with its beneficial morals and laws, and Geiza's son Vajk was brought up in the new faith, receiving in baptism the name of Stephen.

King Stephen I. (997-1038) received a thorough education by learned Roman Catholic priests, chiefly monks belonging to German, Italian and French orders. Under their benevolent influence he married the enlightened Bavarian Princess Gisella. Stephen was the founder of the Hungarian National State and the Hungarian Church, and he planted successfully the seeds of Western European culture in Hungary, while his Eastern Slavic neighbours became adherents of the Greek-Orthodox eastern religion and embraced the entirely different Byzantine culture. In the year 1000, Pope Sylvester endowed Stephen with the Royal Crown of Hungary, which is still in existence and highly treasured and is called the Sacred Crown.

King Stephen organized the Church into ten bishoprics and the country into forty-six political counties headed by Comes-es (Counts or Lord Lieutenants) and soon achieved a well-governed national state. He sent his ambassadors to the neighbouring countries and ruled according to the practice of his Western neighbours.

Stephen and his son King Imre have been canonized for their great work for Christianity.

The next kings of the House Arpád were Peter and his successor, Aba Samuel (1038-1046). Then followed Andrew I. (1047-1060), Béla I. (1060-1063), Salamon (1064-1074) and Géza (1074-1077). Unfortunately, these kings did not possess the magnificent qualities of St. Stephen or Imre. They left the country and the great organizations of Stephen in a deplorable state.

The following Kings of Hungary, however, carried through great tasks, not only for their own country but also for Western European civilization and Christianity.

St. Ladislaus (1077-1095) organized the great Hungarian crusading armies to preserve Christianity in an era of the onslaughts from the Far East. He was the first Hungarian king who recognized also the necessity for an outlet to the sea, and he gained for his country a part of Croatia and the Adriatic coast. He

founded the first Roman Catholic bishopric in Zagreb (Croatia), planting with that the first seeds of Christianity and Christian culture in the thousand-year-old Croatia. Almost every historian in Europe mentions the name of St. Ladislaus, King of Hungary, with the greatest reverence and admiration and describes him as a benefactor of mankind.

Ladislaus was worthily succeeded by Koloman (1095-1116). He continued the works of St. Stephen and St. Ladislaus. He fought successfully the Venetian republic and enlarged the power of Hungary over the coast of Croatia, gaining all of Dalmatia on the Adriatic. Koloman organized education and higher learning in Hungary and it was in this era that history calls Hungary the great defender of Christianity.

Koloman was followed by Stephen II. (1116-1131), by Bela II., the blind king (1131-1141), by Géza II. (1141-1162), by Stephen III. (1162-1173), who fought the Comnenos (Comnenian Greek Dynasty), who were related by marriage to the House of Arpád. Manuel, Emperor of the Greeks and of the Eastern Roman Empire, was the grandson of St. Ladislaus of Hungary. He attacked the Hungarians and took Serbia from them (1151-1156). His unrealized plan was to unite Hungary and Greece.

Under Béla III. (1173-1196) and Imre II. (1196-1204) the country felt the influential power of the rich oligarchy which in that era entered into a dominance which was to endure for centuries. This oligarchy in Hungary became so intolerable, especially under the unstable rule of Andrew II. (1205-123 5), that he had to organize an army against it to protect the royal authority. At his coronation, the nobiity,[1] gathered in National Assembly, demanded for the first time that the King take an oath to the country. It was from this Assembly that the Hungarian constitution, "The Golden Bulla,"[2] developed (in 1222).

The Golden Bulla gave the right of veto and of resistance to the nobility and prelates in the Assembly against the King. They were even permitted to arm themselves against the King, should he not keep the laws, without being

1 By nobility is to be understood the Magyar freemen in comparison to such subjects of the King as had no political and religious rights.

considered as committing high treason. In this new constitution it was clearly expressed that the nobility and High Clergy shared equal rights in government with the King.

"The Hungarian nobility," says Knatchbull-Hugessen, the British historian, in "The Political Evolution of the Hungarian Nation," "was no privileged caste but was synonymous and coextensive with the whole Magyar nation, and it is essential to a comprehension of subsequent history that this fact should not be forgotten."

Béla IV. (123 5-1270) tried in vain to clear the royal power and government of the influence of his father's scheming advisers. In fact, the country was divided between him and his two sons; one of them, Stephen, rose against him. The Assembly in 1267 provided for the return of lands usurped by the tyrannical magnates of Hungary. This same Assembly re-affirmed the freedom of all the nobles and clergy from taxation unless imposed with their consent and expressed in general meeting. The same law emphasized also that there was no obligation for the nobility to go to war for the King, especially if these wars were on foreign territories; indeed only a voluntary service was recognized.

Under Béla IV, Hungary met one of her greatest catastrophes. The Mongolian and Tartar hordes came from Asia, led by Genghis Khan, and destroyed the

2 It is a mistake to suppose, as many apparently do, that Hungary became a constitutional Monarchy by virtue of the "Golden Bulla." The Bulla was, in the first place, the Charter of Liberties of the lesser nobles: that is to say, of the mass of the nation, a confirmation or a re-affirmation, as clearly appears from the text, of existing rights and of the old established principles of the equality of all Magyar freemen. Further, it strengthened and protected the Royal power, it reinstated and revived the authority of the King, which had suffered so much from the daring and powerful Hungarian oligarchy. The essential difference between this document and the English Magna Charts which made King John of England exclaim: "By God's teeth I will not grant them liberties which will make me a slave" is apparent, but the points of resemblance are equally striking. (Knatchbull-Hugessen, "Political Evolution of Hungary," pg. 26.) And, like the English Magna Charta, the Hungarian "Golden Bulla" is the real preamble to and the later source of the Constitution and of all liberties, which at that time consisted only of a royal patent given without consulting the counsel of political Hungary and the Church.

greater part of Hungary and her population. But—as had happened before on several occasions—Hungary with its racial and national valour stopped, even in defeat, the disastrous incursions of the barbarian masses against Christianity and the civilization of Western Europe. The geographical position of Hungary, it seems, pre-destined her to be the rampart of Western civilization against the Eastern onslaughts, to be the bulwark of Western culture, peace and Christianity.

Béla IV gathered 65,000 warriors on the banks of the Sajó River, at Muhi, near Miskolc,[3] in North Hungary, April, 1241, to check the Tartars. His brave Hungarian army was entirely exterminated. His son Koloman, Archbishop Ugron, and the Archbishop of Strygonia fell on the battlefield, and the King fled with his treasurer to Austria, where instead of receiving hospitality he was robbed by his host, Duke Frederick of Austria.

News reached Western Europe that Hungary had been almost wiped out of existence by the Asiatic conquerors Genghis Khan and Batu Khan, who ventured as far west as Vienna and as far south as Spalato on the Adriatic. In the meantime the beaten Hungarians re-formed an army at the cities of Györ and Székesfehérvár and repulsed the Tartar hordes with heavy losses; the famous Hungarian Cavalry suffered especially. The retreat of Genghis Khan toward the Far East brought a new disaster, however, to Hungary, for his soldiers sacked and murdered as they fled.

Béla IV. was followed by Stephen V. (1270-1272), Ladislaus IV. (1272-1290) and Andrew III. (1290-1301). During the reign of these three last kings of the House of Árpád the royal authority and the structure of administration diminished to such an extent that the powerful nobles with their "private armies" practically divided the country among themselves and exercised the real power in the kingdom. However, such conditions prevailed not only in Hungary, but throughout Europe, at this time.

All Hungarian historians agree that during the reign of the Árpád kings Hungary was able to develop according to the ideas of Western civilization

3 Recently in this ancient city most valuable archeological discoveries have been made - among others a perfect big stag of pure heavy gold.

and Christianity; and, what is especially important, she was able to lay the foundation of a truly National State in the form of a Monarchy. She was able to maintain her independence and national authority, even though they were often at stake when she had to act as a buffer between East and West. During the reign of the House of Árpád, Hungary acquired Croatia, Dalmatia, Ráma or Bosnia, Kulmia, Serbia, Galicia, one part of Bulgaria and the famous plains of the Kuns. The kings of the House of Árpád invited many foreign educators from the West of Europe, especially German, French and Italian scholars, who settled in the country permanently. New cities were built and developed, the Church was organized, art advanced and the real progress of the middle classes was begun. And, while the King lost many of his autocratic rights, the rights and power of the nobility grew and developed later into the parliamentary life of the nation. The general condition was far from perfect, but it was similar to that of West European countries of that epoch.

King Andrew III. (son of Stephen II. and Princess Maria D'Este) was the last male issue of the great Árpád Dynasty. With him ended the line that gave the nation heroes and saints, among them St. Elizabeth of Thuringia, the daughter of Andrew, who is the picturesque heroine of Franz Liszt's beautiful opera: "The Legend of Saint Elizabeth."

THE HUNGARIAN ANGOVINS

Charles Robert of Anjou was the next heir to the throne of Hungary. Although himself a French-Italian Prince, a descendant on his mother's side of the House of Árpád, he ascended, with the help of the Pope, Boniface VIII, to the throne of the Árpáds. The House of Anjou came originally, in 1060, from the province which is known in France today as the Maine et Loire Département. The Anjou family ruled in Sicily, Italy and Naples and, from 1308 to 1395, in Hungary. They are credited during their short reign in Hungary with having reorganized the authority of the Kingdom against the powerful oligarchy of the Hungarian nobles and established a firm government, a great benefit to the nation. Charles Robert, in fact, restored Hungary to the position of a flourishing national state.

Notorious in his reign is the terrible tragedy of the illustrious Hungarian noble family, Zách, which illustrates vividly the morals of the times. Zách, a powerful noble, lived at the King's court in the royal Borough of Visegrád (the ruins of the royal castle can still be seen from the Danube near Budapest).

With him lived his daughter, Klára, who was first lady-in-waiting to the Queen Elizabeth, a Polish Princess of royal blood. The Queen's brother, Prince Otto of Poland, dishonoured the beautiful Klára Zách (some historians say that it was done with the knowledge of the Queen). She ran in despair to her father, who, hearing her story, burst in a wild rage into the royal banqueting hail with a drawn sword in his hand just as the King and the Queen with the entire royal family were gathered for dinner. In an attempt to avenge his dishonoured child, Zách severely wounded the Queen, but before he could kill the young Prince the guards stabbed him to death. The King himself presided at the trial of Klára. She was condemned to die. After being tortured, she was fastened to the feet of a wild horse and dragged to death. Four generations of the great Zách family were entirely exterminated in both male and female lines.

Charles Robert conducted several campaigns outside the confines of Hungary. In 1319 he reconquered the Banate of Macsó (northwest Serbia) from Milutin, the Serbian King, whose son Uros swore allegiance to him. In 1328 he subdued Bosnia, though he was, compelled to allow the Dalmatian coast towns to accept the suzerainty of Venice.

Louis the Great (1342-1382), son of Charles Robert of Anjou, became one of the greatest kings of Hungary. The power of his government extended from the North Sea to the Black Sea, and from there to the Adriatic. Petöfi, one of Hungary's immortal poets, who fell in Kossuth's army during the Revolution in 1848, refers to Hungarian power under Louis the Great in the following poem,[4] here translated into English:

Oh, great was once the Hungarian

Great were his power and possessions,

In the waves of Hungarian seas

Sank the stars of North, East and South.

4 Oh, nagy volt hajdan a Magyar, Nagy volt hatalma, birtoka, Magyar tenger vizében hunyt el Eszak, kelet, a dél hulló csillaga.

In 1370 Louis gained the crown of Poland. He introduced feudalism from Western Europe; he also became the founder of the first Hungarian University of Pécs. His wife, Queen Elizabeth, a Polish Princess, gave him only daughters. Having no male issue, he persuaded his wife to retire into a convent from which, however, he later recalled her, as his Conscience would not permit him to take another wife. He enacted a law by which his daughter Maria was to receive the title “Sovereign” of Hungary after his death, and his younger daughter, Hedwig, the title “Sovereign” of Poland. Maria was crowned Queen of Hungary in 1382, at the age of eleven; two years later her sister Hedwig became ruler of Poland. Later the malcontent nobles of the country, who did not recognize the King's daughters as legal rulers, invited Charles of Durazzo (Anjou) to ascend the throne of Hungary. Charles was crowned; but soon after the coronation he was assassinated ~y the loyal troops of Maria.

The Pope now ordered the Hungarian Roman Catholic clergy, in several secret encyclicals, to agitate among the influential people of the country for the election of Prince Ladislaus of Naples as King. The King of one part of Hungary at that time was Sigismund of Brandenburg (1387-1437), a “heretic,” and this fact provided sufficient cause for the Holy See to agitate in a Catholic country. But Sigismund, with his loyal army, won a decisive victory over the Papal favourite and firmly established his power. His first royal act was to introduce the law of *Placetum Regium*, according to which the Hungarian clergy was forbidden to correspond directly with the Holy See, and was not permitted to publish any Papal orders or encyclicals without the previous knowledge and consent of the Government.

Albrecht, Duke of Austria (1438-1439), the husband of Sigismund's only daughter, followed as the next King of Hungary. He was the first Habsburg on the Hungarian throne. He introduced the office of the Palatinate, a direct representative of the King. The creation of this high office (Viceroy) was necessary to protect the interest of the Hungarian State against foreign powers, because Albrecht was not only King of Hungary but also Duke of Austria and as such a member of the German Empire. The year after his death his widowed Queen married Ladislaus III. of Poland, who by this marriage received the crown of Hungary (1440-1444).

3. FROM THE HUNYADIS TO THE HABSBURGS

John Hunyadi, the son of a simple country squire, became one of the greatest Hungarian patriots and one of the foremost military leaders of his age. He received for his services to the State the fort of Hunyad with the adjacent properties, and became the Count of Bestercze as well. The King also appointed him Wojwodje (Governor) of Transylvania, a member of the King's Privy Council, and Governor-General of Belgrade [then a major fort on the Southern border of Hungary]. His military abilities assured him a leading position throughout Europe. The Turks, in attacking Hungary, now menaced not only Hungary but the entire Western European Christianity and civilization, with their powerful armies, and Hungary paid then a terrible price for saving that Christianity and civilization, the backbone of our present civilization.

The policy of Sultan Murad of Turkey was to establish the power of the Ottoman Empire and Mohammedanism all over Western Europe. His ambitions were severely checked by Hunyadi, who decisively defeated Murad's armies at St. Imre in 1442 and drove the Turks beyond the banks of the Danube in the battle of Hátszeg. On the Hungarian side all this warfare was to protect Christianity. The Vatican, together with Venice, Burgundy, and other Christian States, sent envoys to Buda, the capital of Hungary, offering assistance to the king against the dreaded Turkish invasion. On account of Hunyadi's brilliant record in strategy, Sultan Murad hesitated to launch an attack, and offered to conclude a favourable peace with Hungary (Szeged, 1444). But the Papal envoy, Cardinal Julian Ceasarini, advised the King, Uladislaus I. of Hungary, and his Privy Council,- without previous consultation with Hunyadi, - not to accept the Sultan's offer, because the Turks were not to be trusted. With an army of 100,000 Murad challenged the Hungarians, whose army then numbered thirty-eight thousand. The battle took place at Varna. Hunyadi's forces pressed on to the Headquarters of the Sultan, whose army had already started to retreat.

But vanity and jealousy in the Hungarian Court succeeded, disastrously for the country, in persuading the weak and hesitating King to take over the supreme command from Hunyadi, whose power had grown far too great to suit the courtiers. The young King led the army himself. Under the influence

of his Court again, and without consulting his faithful general Hunyadi, he ordered the Hungarian reserves to attack the Turks. He lost the battle and his life. The Turks cut off the King's head, and carried it aloft on a high pole. The effect of this was so demoralizing to the Hungarian soldiers that they started to retreat in wild disorder, and the army was literally wiped out of existence by the Turks. The Papal envoy, Cardinal Ceasarini, tried in vain to gather the troops together again. He was killed in the very first minutes of his effort. General Hunyadi was barely able to save his own life. And so, on November 10, 1444, through irresponsible intrigues and jealousy of the Hungarian Court, the most important battle of that epoch was lost, and the defeat prepared the way for a new political chapter in European history.

The advent of Mohammedan influence in the Balkans resulted in the *bouleversement* of social and political conditions in the countries bordering Turkey and the planting of the seeds of ceaseless wars.

Hunyadi returned to Buda, where he was appointed Governor-General of Hungary and invested with almost royal powers. After a thorough reorganization he again marched against Sultan Murad with an army of 25,000 men; but he was defeated in a three-day battle at Kosovo Polje (the Field of Blackbirds) principally on account of the treason of the Wallachian troops employed in the Hungarian army. Later, after the fall of Constantinople, he defeated the Turks in the memorable battle of Belgrade in 1456, where the Sultan, severely wounded, fled the field.

Civilized Europe of the fifteenth century recognized in Hunyadi the real protector and even saviour of Western Europe, although Hungary was left to her fate.

Hungary learned nothing from history. Hardly had General Hunyadi and his aide, the Capucine monk, John Capistran[1], perished in the plague, than the Court began its intrigues anew. King Ladislaus V. (1453-1457), successor of Uladislaus III., was as weak as and even more demoralized than his predecessor. The Court was soon able to persuade him to arrest Count Ladislaus Hunyadi, son of the great general, his most loyal friend, who was

1 His name is immortalized in California's Capistrano Mission.

brought to Buda in chains and beheaded. Horrified and impassioned, the nation rose against the King, and forced him to flee to Prague, where he took with him Count Matthias Hunyadi, the fifteen-year-old brother of the murdered Ladislaus to prevent his election to the throne. King Ladislaus, however, died in the same year (1457) and Hungary elected Matthias, or Matthias, as King.

King Matthias (1458-1490) was in every sense a national King. He established order among the malcontents and extended the frontiers of the country as far as the boundaries under Louis the Great. He even annexed all of Austria, with the capital, Vienna, and Styria. He gained a reputation for wise statecraft and military leadership, establishing the first permanent army and the first light cavalry in Central Europe—the latter is still in existence as the famous Hungarian Hussars. He also organized the "Black Brigades," the most feared army in all Europe. He established first the Danubian Federation, the union of the States in the Danube valley, which was again actively championed by Louis Kossuth in 1848. Even today the Danubian Federation is the logical future combination for the small nations along the Danube. This King also organized the courts of justice in Hungary, and history mentions him as "Matthew the Just."

But Matthias was greater as general than as diplomat. He ruled over Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, but he nevertheless wished to become Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, and it was this ambition which brought him into conflict with the German Emperor, whose good will he was never able to secure. Within his own country, too, he had great difficulties. On account of his independent nature, he lost the support of the clergy and, mainly on account of his humble origin, the over-powerful magnates turned against him, treating him as a parvenu. The peasantry, also, disliked him for levying heavy taxes.

The landed gentry and the soldiers, alone, remained royal to him when he faced Prince Kasimir, son of the King of Poland, who had come with a large army to invade the country. It was not long before Matthias learned that the Polish Prince had been invited to "visit" Hungary by Cardinal Prince-Primate John Vitéz, who once served as Matthias' tutor. The Polish forces were defeated, and in 1476 the treaty of Olmütz concluded. Cardinal Vitéz attempted to flee the country, but was captured.

In the same year King Matthias also defeated the invading Turks at Sabatz on the Save and, three years later, he again defeated them in Transylvania with the help of General Paul Kinisi. Through this last battle new territories came to Hungary in the north and west. The year 1477 brought Matthias at last into armed conflict with Emperor Frederick of Germany, whom he defeated, thus bringing the whole of Austria and Styria under his dominion. He at once moved into the Imperial Palace in Vienna, where he resided until 1485. His reputation in Europe grew to such an extent that Martin Luther exclaimed: "I wish Germany could have an Emperor like Matthias."

THE HUNGARIAN RENAISSANCE

King Matthias surrounded himself and his Court with the greatest culture of the age. In 1476 he married Beatrice, Princess of Aragonia, daughter of Ferdinand, King of Naples, as his second Queen. Through his Italian connection Matthias practically brought the Italian Renaissance into his Court. But although in Beatrice the King married one of the most beautiful and most accomplished women of that epoch, her influence was detrimental to the high and just standards of Matthias. Galeotti, the Italian astronomer and chief librarian at his Court, wrote in his memoirs about the Queen: "The woman of Naples, because of her great position, her rare beauty and wit, was superlative in all her attributes, but at the bottom she was not a human being." In her madness for mastery she made the King, in a weak moment, promise to appoint her eight-year-old nephew, the Prince Hyppolito of Ferrara, as Cardinal of Hungary (with a coadjutor, of course). Soon after his marriage Matthias founded the Istropolis, the Academy of higher learning at Pozsony, which is still in existence there, as the University of the city. He founded the Corvina library at Buda, most of which is preserved at the Royal Museum at Budapest. But a few volumes from this most famous book collection are to be found, already, in New York City, in the private library of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan.

The Court of Matthias became the setting of unprecedented splendour, outrivalling the magnificence of even the famous courts of France and England. The enormous extravagance of the Queen was something, however, which the King found unbearable.

History describes Matthias' government as the best in Central Europe, and politically Matthias elevated Hungary to be the greatest power in that section

of Europe; the might of Hungary penetrated into Asia and even Africa. Like his great father, he drove the Turks far back to the Balkans. He regained the line of the Danube with the peace concluded at Szeged (1444), and these crusading victories of Matthias must forever be regarded by Western Europe in Hungary's favour. During Matthias' lifetime the Sultan of Turkey never dared to injure the integrity of Hungary. Alas, after his death the Ottoman empire became again the aggressive danger for Western European Christianity. During the thirty-two years of his reign this King re-codified the thus far very imperfect Hungarian Common Law, established absolutely just, and for that age even perfect, jurisdiction, applicable from the highest down to the lowest, in a system of law which became the true and real protector of the weak against the strong. Efficiency and industry were so much a part of his character, that he created for the first time in the history of Hungary an efficient and truly industrious official class.

Matthias also did great work in developing and perfecting the towns of Hungary. Several cities were entirely rebuilt during his reign, for instance Debreczen and Buda, where he constructed his Royal Palace, which was far superior to all others. This is still in existence, though of course rebuilt, and composes the middle wing of the present Royal Palace of Budapest.

In many towns of Hungary also German culture was introduced under Matthias.

Cattle and agricultural export were the chief sources of living in Hungary, but under Matthias the mining industries, especially as seen in the iron and copper exported to the north of Europe, were so famous in their methods of smelting that France imitated Hungary in her system.

Matthias died at Vienna, no doubt as the greatest National king of Hungary, in 1490. Hungary mourned him with the words: "Matthias is dead, justice is aead."

His only successor was an illegitimate son, the highly gifted Prince John Corvin. The Queen, however, was able, by her innumerable intrigues, to check the King's efforts to legitimize his beloved son. She hated the Prince: for she herself wanted to rule. She was willing to marry anyone who would become her ally in her mad struggle for power.

The era after Matthias is, perhaps, the saddest and darkest in Hungarian history. The kings who followed him—Ulászló II. (1490-1516) and his son, Louis II. (1516-1526)—left despair and almost irreparable disasters behind them, and the much-enduring Hungarian nation faced once more one of the most terrible dramas of history.

FROM MATTHIAS TO THE HABSBURGS

John Szapolyai (1526-1540), one of the most powerful magnates of the country, who later became King of the greater part of Hungary, assembled the Hungarian nobles and prelates at Buda, as requested by Queen Beatrice; and upon his pressure this National Diet disqualified Matthias' illegitimate son, Prince John Corvin, as heir to the throne of Hungary. Szapolyai, backed by a powerful army, further "advised" this assembly to invite Uladislaus II. of Bohemia, from the House of Jagello, well known to be a weakling, to the throne of Hungary. This King of Hungary, who said "yes" to everything, was called by the people "Dobrze László," meaning "King Yes."

We have had enough of the energy, fairness and justice of Matthias Hunyadi and his father," exclaimed the friends of Szapolyai at the assembly, and they soon persuaded the King to marry Beatrice, the widow of Matthias. She immediately seized the royal power and decisively defeated the famous "Black Brigades" of Matthias, which were led by the "Pretender," John Corvin. His treasury was seized, and his army dispersed. Szapolyai played the leading part in this conspiracy against the honourable and talented son of his dead master. For his services the Queen appointed him Palatine of Hungary. He, however, soon seized the royal properties and thus paved his own way to the throne of Hungary.

Ulaszló II. was nothing but a plaything in the hands of the rich Hungarian oligarchs, who step by step annihilated everything good created under Matthias. The corrupt actions of the highest officials of the country brought the nobles to join in the opposition. The King's government was fiercely and constantly attacked in the National Assembly, and the King himself, poor and friendless, lived a miserable, uncertain life at the mercy of his royal household. A decision at the Diet of 1492 made him absolutely helpless as his only income was the receipts of the Treasury, which amounted to almost exactly nothing. The proud and wonderful armies of Matthias became demoralized. They never received any pay, and consequently they stole where they could; so

it came about that the best army in Europe, the Black Brigades, had to be dispersed on account of their deep deterioration.

As a geographical entity Hungary diminished rapidly, losing one province after another. These chaotic conditions encouraged the Turks, who seized the Hungarian province of Bosnia. Many Hungarian officials and nobles were forced by the Turks to become Mohammedans in order to save their lives and properties. The Wlachs of Wallachia, now Rumania, became the vassals of Turkey. The Hungarian Assembly, dominated by the powerful but retrograde oligarchs, easily and with one decree destroyed the most magnificent army in the whole of Europe; and this was done of deliberate purpose. For under Matthias this standing army had enforced the fairness and the just institutions of the dead king with fearless honesty and rigour against the magnates. These magnates did not want such an army any more. . . . Such decadent and selfish action soon showed its results. The same Assembly concluded in 1491—on November 7, only a few months after Matthias' death—the shameful Peace Treaty with Emperor Maximillian of Austria, that Treaty of Pozsony according to which Hungary not only returned all Austria to Maximilian but ceded also a great Hungarian territory with it and paid a war indemnity equal to the enormous sum of one million dollars.

The "Magyar Freemen" became better organized in the National Assembly later. Hungary was again without an armed force. Only the powerful magnates and prelates had their own individual forces, called *banderiums.*

These military *banderiums* (smaller brigades) were absolutely private, well paid and organized by their masters, the powerful oligarchs; but at the same time they had a Hungarian national character. Nevertheless, they were used in the first intention only for private purposes; and their second object was to deliver the absolutely powerless King into the hands of this rich oligarchy. Such demoralization and the steadily growing ill-treatment of the peasantry, slowly led the country to another catastrophe. Despite such internal conditions, for the first time in Hungarian history the nation achieved independent action in her foreign policy during this period of from ten to fifteen years. These circumstances would have been a great asset in the hands of a true Hungarian patriot in regaining such lost Hungarian property as Dalmatia, and an access to the sea. But Cardinal Bakócz, one of the most able diplomats of Europe and the chief adviser to the King, favoured Venice, and gave much aid to the Venetian government without gaining any recompense

for Hungary. The ambitious Cardinal hoped through Venice to gain access to the Papacy; and because of these vain hopes the Hungarian foreign policy was used, not to the advantage of the country, but for the diplomat's own personal glory.

Fear of the prelates and the nobility grew, and as the lower gentry could not fight the oligarchs, the peasants were suppressed.[2] A complete anarchy overcame the country which under Matthias has been so well governed; the ruling classes lacked vision and judgment and sacrificed everything for personal interests.

Cardinal Bakócz, the Prince-Primate of Hungary, returned from his quest for the Papacy in Rome, and in 1514 formed a crusading army against the Turks. The Privy Council of the King objected vigorously to a Cardinal arming the discontented peasantry. A general uprising was feared. Despite the royal veto, Cardinal Bakócz continued the organization of the Hungarian peasantry under the command of George Dózsa of Transylvania. The peasants soon became aware of their armed power and on their way to the front they committed the most bestial atrocities against the nobles and their families.

Szapolyai, at that time Governor of Transylvania, appeared with a strong army against the uprising peasants and routed them with the greatest cruelty. Dózsa, their leader, for example, was seated alive on an iron throne and grilled to death by fire.

The mutiny of the peasantry had far-reaching results. Szapolyai became the idol of one faction of the nobles. The National Assembly gathered again at Buda and enacted in *1515* a new law against the peasants: "also all of them

2 According to the ancient constitution of Hungary, in force almost until the outbreak of the Hungarian Revolution, 1848, only the nobles and the prelates had the right to vote and were members without election of the National Assembly. The constitution held that the King ruled and the Crown governed. The "Crown" was composed of the King and the National Assembly, in which the greater part of the clergy was included. The peasants had no vote; they paid the taxes and worked on the estates of the nobility and clergy. The nobility and clergy were exempt from taxation. Such conditions prevailed not only in Hungary but all over Europe.

deserve the penalty of death," reads this law, "but, as the Hungarian prelates and nobility cannot live without the farm hand, solely for these reasons it is decided that only their leaders have to die and the damned rest shall be decimated" (which meant one in every ten to be killed). "The rest shall become slaves forever with no right to move from one place to another. From now on they alone shall pay the taxes beside one full day a week unpaid for their work on the estates of the prelates and nobles." The law added: "No son of a peasant shall ever become a bishop."

The natural result of such laws was that the peasants were unable to develop for many years and seeds of bitter class hatred were sown.

Ulászló II. died on March 13, 1516. Louis, his ten-year-old son, became the King of Hungary (1516-1526).

The conditions in Hungary were considered ripe by Suliman II., Sultan of Turkey, who prepared his armies this time to deal a deadly blow against the ruined nation.

MOHÁCS

In 1526 Szapolyai concentrated an army of over 16,000 near Buda. The National Assembly authorized the King to mobilize the nobles to save the country. But only a fragment of the nobility joined the King's army; in the middle of August about 25,000 badly-equipped noblemen gathered under the King's command to meet the formidable army of the Sultan. Archbishop Tomory had the Supreme Command and he advised not to attack the Turk until the Hungarian forces should be reorganized and brought to full strength by reserves. But the irresponsible Court again intervened. They did not like Tomory because he was far too able for them. Upon the advice of his Court, the King himself took the Supreme Command and attacked the Turks on the heights of Mohács, August 29, 1526.

Tomory, leading the advance with the Apostolic cross in his right, was killed and with him the Prince-Primate of Hungary. Louis II., only twenty-one years of age, perished in the deep morasses of the moorland as the Hungarian troops retreated before the onslaught of Suliman's army. The flower of Hungary, 24,000 noblemen, with five bishops and the King, died vainly, to open the door upon a terrible drama of history. Szapolyai, with his large idle reserves at

Buda, could have turned the course of Hungarian history differently, if he had attacked the Turks. But Szapolyai, this time as ever, thought of his own fortunes and not of the welfare of the nation. . .

The disaster of Mohács resulted in the division of Hungary into three parts, and deprived the nation of her independence for a hundred and fifty years. The country was governed from Constantinople. Szapolyai, besides letting the Sultan take Buda without the slightest resistance, seized the Royal treasure, of which he returned the greater part some time later. And instead of attacking the Sultan, he called the National Assembly to Alba Regia and, backed by his army, forced his own election as King of Hungary (1526-1540). The widow of Louis II. defied Szapolyai's election and another party of the Hungarian nobility elected the Queen's brother, Archduke Ferdinand of Austria. This state of affairs brought about a civil war between the claimants, and after some fighting Ferdinand forced the elected Szapolyai to flee to Poland, but in November of the same year he was elected regularly King of Hungary.

Hungary now had two kings, Ferdinand I. of Habsburg and John Szapolyai, who was recalled in 1529 by Sultan Suliman from his exile to rule over one part of Hungary; the Sultan's policies preferred to see in Buda his "own" king as a competitor to Ferdinand of Habsburg.

After King John Szapolyai died, on the 18th of July, 1540, the Sultan appeared again, in 1541, at Buda and divided the country into three parts. Hungary then had three rulers: King Ferdinand of Habsburg; the baby son of John Szapolyai, King John Sigismund, whose election as King was a After King John Szapolyai died, on the 18th of July, 1540, the Sultan appeared again, in 1541, at Buda and divided the country into three parts. Hungary then had three rulers: King Ferdinand of Habsburg; the baby son of John Szapolyai, King John Sigismund, whose election as King was a violation of the Treaty of Nagyvárad that had recognized Ferdinand of Habsburg as the successor of John Szapolyai, regardless of the latter's issue; and the Sultan, whose huge army remained in Buda for a hundred and fifty years. Ferdinand tried to attack Buda, but was unsuccessful.

Turkish oppression united the fighting political factions of Hungary once more. The catastrophe of Mohács brought noble and peasant together and Hungarian tenacity, industry and patriotism worked in harmony to further

the interests of the country. This age is known as the age of individual heroism and statesmanship.

The army of Joachim of Brandenburg, which came to the assistance of King Ferdinand, met a disastrous defeat at Buda in 1543. Peace was declared under terms which gave the Sultan a large yearly tribute from Hungary and allowed him to remain in possession of Hungarian territory, which he annexed.

Hungary now earnestly begged the Emperor Ferdinand of Austria for help. The monk, George Martinuzzi, one of the outstanding statesmen of that troubled epoch, and later Cardinal of Hungary, managed to eradicate the differences between King Ferdinand and the advisers of the youthful King John Sigismund. In reality he guarded very cleverly the interests of John Szapolyai's youthful son, John Sigismund, whose tutor he was. Martinuzzi the monk had started his career as a dashing army officer, aide-decamp to King John Szapolyai, who soon recognized his abilities and trusted him with the education and guidance of his small son. So at twenty-eight Martinuzzi gave up his military career for the priesthood, an act which was not uncommon in those days.

The Sultan for personal political reasons favoured John Sigismund against Ferdinand, and he shortly appointed him the reigning Duke of the Principalities of Oppeln and Ratibor. Martinuzzi, the shrewd diplomat, however, delivered the Hungarian sacred crown, which was always the symbol of rulership over Hungary, to Ferdinand, who, in turn, appointed the obliging Martinuzzi to be Prince Cardinal of Hungary. The clever diplomacy of "Frater Martinuzzi" (as he was called) did not stop with this action. He soon arranged a marriage between his protege, John Sigismund, and Ferdinand of Habsburg's daughter.

Martinuzzi not only proved to be one of the greatest diplomats of his age, but he was also blessed with real and great military talents: he twice defeated the Turks, in 1551 and 1552. But jealousy and suspicion worked also at the Court of Ferdinand of Habsburg, and suddenly the Austrian General Castaldo was appointed as Commander-in-Chief of the Austrian Army. Martinuzzi's activities were brought to a sudden end by hired assassins of Castaldo. Some of the Hungarian historians agree that the Cardinal was murdered with the knowledge of the highest State authorities of Austria, who dreaded Martinuzzi's vast and growing power. Besides, Martinuzzi was too rich to suit

them. His large fortune and treasures were immediately seized by Castaldo, in the name of the King.

To avenge this murder, and as a serious move against the power of the Habsburgs, the Sultan appointed John Sigismund as Duke of Transylvania under Turkish suzerainty. And so Hungary became once more the battleground of the innumerable fights between the Habsburgs and the Turks, who always protected the young Prince of Transylvania. Ferdinand refused to recognize John Sigismund as the rightful ruler of Transylvania. Turkish armies were dispatched to protect the Sultan's favourite, and bloody war ensued between the Turks and the armies of Ferdinand, who was supported by Hungary, because Hungarians preferred death on the battlefield to prison and servitude under the yoke of the Pashas.

Into this period comes the siege of Szigetvár by the Turks, in 1566. In the immediately following years the fight of the Habsburgs for power brought several calamitous Turkish invasions upon Hungary; and the heroic defense of the fortress of Szigetvár by its immortal commander Nicholas Zrinyi stopped for months the advance of the Turks into the country. Even foreign historians call this siege the most classical in world history. Starvation faced the heroic garrison, and rather than to die of hunger after such a long defense Zrinyi resolved to hurl himself with his troops upon the far superior numbers of the enemy in a last desperate encounter. Clad in his finest costume, with a hundred gold pieces in his pockets (as a reward for his slayer), he led the attack until he was stabbed to death. Every man, and most of the women, perished with the Hungarian battle-cry on their lips.

This age produced also very fine poets and writers, men like Tinódi and Balassa, who, wandering around the devastated country, sang the ever-living ballads of Hungarian heroism.

Hungary, too, played a great role as a Christian State in fighting the Turks, during a time which enabled the neighbouring states of Western Europe to develop in peace, while she was bleeding and bearing the brunt of Turkish savagery.

The age of reformation was not, at first, sympathetically received in the Kingdom of Hungary, perhaps for the reason that it came from Germany. In the beginning Hungarians adopted the Reformed faith of Luther, Zwingli and

Calvin in Transylvania. Hungary, which had always been a predominantly Catholic country, had at that time two Catholic Kings, but that could not counterbalance this religious movement. The first Protestant Synod in Hungary was held in 1545 at Erdöd. Most of the Hungarian citizens of German origin became Lutherans, while the native Hungarians preferred Calvinism. In Transylvania the Unitarian church attracted large numbers. Even Duke John Sigismund of Transylvania, in spite of his Habsburg wife, protected Protestantism. With only a few exceptions the old Duchy of Transylvania entirely gave up Catholicism.

Protestantism in the Duchy continued to flourish under Stephen Báthory, who reigned after John Sigismund. Báthory, himself an ardent Catholic, was exceedingly tolerant. His nephew and successor, Sigismund Báthory, who was brought up by the Jesuit Fathers, differed greatly, however, from his uncle. He was a man of abnormal mental powers, slightly unbalanced, often to the point of insanity; cruel, selfish, unscrupulous, and a bigoted Catholic. He married the Archduchess Christienna, the daughter of Rudolph of Habsburg, Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary, and she brought him into close political relations with his mighty father-in-law. So, naturally, he did not accept the Turkish supremacy, and refused to pay the tributes to the Sultan, a stand which made Transylvania the centre of fierce struggles. His Court, filled with frivolous and jealous courtiers, aroused the Prince's suspicion against his first adviser, the very talented Chancellor Stephen Jósika. Sigismund Báthory, believing that Jósika was scheming for the throne, ordered his instant execution in his own presence, together with his favourite cousin, Balthasar Báthory.

After Jósika, the Italian Bishop Carrillo became his first adviser, a man even more cruel than Báthory himself. He vigorously persecuted the Protestants, religious freedom vanished, and the old constitution of the country was flouted. Then Báthory abdicated, he also tried the priesthood; and the Archduchess was sent to a convent.

After his abdication the Diet of Transylvania invited the Habsburgs to rule. Vienna sent General Basta as Imperial Governor, a man who left nothing but hatred and despair behind him. The army of General Basta ruined beautiful Transylvania for a long period, and the result of this religious intolerance and the oppression of Protestantism was that the North rose under the leadership

of the powerful magnate Steven Bocskay, who was elected Prince of Transylvania on April 5, 1605. He died in 1606.

With his fearless armies Bocskay attacked the two Habsburg Generals, Basta and Belgiojosa, defeating them each separately and decisively. The Hungarian nobility elected him King of Hungary, an honour which he never accepted. Of course the Sultan of Turkey sent his special ambassador with a royal crown. The sole aim of this great ruler was to bring about real peace, which was accepted in the name of the Emperor King Rudolph by his brother Archduke Matthias, and was ratified at the Peace Treaty of Vienna on June 24, 1606.

Bocskay's terms were: full freedom and security for all Protestant religions; further, to discharge from office and punish severely, and even banish forever, all those advisers of Rudolph who were disloyal to Hungary and Transylvania. These promises in the peace treaty were not kept, of course. The imported Jesuit arders were allowed to continue their activities, and soon the Emperor of Austria insisted with a royal manifesto that "his beloved Hungarian people" must adhere to the Roman Catholic Church and be faithful to the clergy of that Faith.

Bocskay also negotiated a successful peace treaty between Rudolph and the Sultan of Turkey on November 11, 1606—an achievement which was of very great political and economical value to Hungary, as for the first time in history the three parts of Hungary were able to work in a happy balance. At that time Hungary had a territory of 5163 square miles, of which Transylvania had 2082; the annexed territory by the Turks, 1859; and Royal Hungary 1222. Bocskay died soon after his successes—it was alleged from poison.

Unfortunately Austria regarded Hungary only as a rebellious province, and it dealt with Hungary as the advisers of the Emperor suggested. They were very often citizens of far-away countries, ill-posted concerning the national psychology and policies of Hungary. Of course, the guarantees of religious and political freedom were grossly violated. The governmental policies of Hungary were dictated from Vienna and a favourable change came only as the very popular Austrian Archduke, Matthias, the brother of Rudolph, whom the Hungarians loved, was elected King of Hungary, November 16, 1606.

The unicameral system of the legislature was modified in 1572 by the addition of the Upper House, according to the British system. The Lower House was composed of the Landed Gentry; and the Upper House, which was called the House of the Magnates (until the collapse after the World War) was composed of the newly titled aristocracy, the high Clergy, the Free Lords, Barons and Counts. (The titles of the Hungarian aristocracy date from this period, since the old nobility had no titles.) Membership in the Upper House was hereditary and its original members were selected mostly among those who were loyal to the House of Austria.

As the effect of the spread of Protestantism, it was only natural that in a Catholic country a great reaction of this faith should come. In 1601 appeared before the public in Hungary the great Jesuit orator Peter Pázmány, whose genius and magnificent work rendered an unusually great service, not alone to the Roman Catholic Church, but also to civilization and culture throughout Hungary. Pázmány's work was undertaken after the Hungarian malcontents had turned to Protestantism in greater numbers, chiefly for political reasons. The influence of the Dukes of Transylvania was carried also outside their Duchies. So, for instance, the Hungarian Assembly at Pozsony, especially the House of Commons, was strong enough to elect its own Protestant candidates until 1622. The Protestant Magnate Thurzó was elected as Palatine of Hungary; it is true he was the last Protestant to any high office, for in 1625 the same National Assembly elected a Catholic Palatine in Count Nicholas Esterházy. The Jesuit orders, under the influence of Pázmány, carried out their campaign in Hungary, as the Jesuits did fifty to sixty years ago in Poland. They re-converted the great powerful families to Catholicism first, because in the age of serfdom the tenants and farmhands, who were serfs and had no private political and religious rights, were compelled to follow their lord and master.

Peter Pázmány, Prince-Primate of Hungary (1616-1637) was not only one of the greatest Catholic Princes of the Church, but he certainly was, also, one of the greatest Hungarian patriots and statesmen the country ever had. His genius showed itself conspicuously as he published the first Hungarian translation of the Bible, counteracting herewith the influence of the Protestant version published by Caspar Károli. With this publication he rendered more service to the Hungarian language and culture than all his predecessors together. He made the foundation of his great propaganda so

strong that seventeen years after his death, in 1650, the work of Pázmány was accomplished, as almost the entire country became Catholicized.

The Habsburg rulers relied principally upon the prelates of the Roman Catholic Church, but in spite of the powerful influence of the Clergy, the Hungarian National Assembly could not be influenced by the Habsburgs (particularly not the Lower House) so far as to incorporate the much-desired law, regarding the hereditary right of the Habsburg to the throne of Hungary. The Lower House, instead, insisted vigorously on its constitutional rights, especially the right to the free election of the King of Hungary.

In Transylvania, the stronghold of Protestantism, Gabriel Báthory had been elected, on November 11, 1608, to rule after Bocskay. The following years proved that Transylvania was also the stronghold of Hungarian liberties, a condition for which the reigning Princes from 1630 to 1648 were chiefly responsible. The foremost among them was Gabriel Bethlen, 1613-1629, from the Iktári line. He was a great champion of the Cause of the Protestants, but at the same time was tolerant toward Catholitism. He carried on several wars against the Emperor of Austria, who was also the king of one part of Hungary, and when it came to the peace of Nicholsburg, December 31, 1621, the rights and wishes of Transylvania toward, and with, Hungary were settled. Bethlen was twice elected King of Hungary, but he never accepted that position. Once it looked as if he would marry the daughter of the ruling Habsburg, but the marriage was never concluded, and he married Catherine of Brandenburg, a Protestant Princess of Germany, with the assistance of Charles Gustavus of Sweden, and the Grand Duke of Hesse, attempted to gain the accession to the throne of Poland. He failed in this attempt when the united Polish armies defeated him in 1660, and in this battle he was killed. This undertaking of Rákóczy proved disastrous to Transylvania.

Among the Princes of Transylvania much credit has to be given to the reigns of Gabriel Bethien and George Rákóczy I. In this period during the Thirty Years War (war between Catholicism and Protestantism) both did very good work for civilization and education in Transylvania. In the continuous wars two outstanding and successful battles took place against the Turks, one won by Nicholas Zrinyi the younger, at Esseg, and the other at Szent Gotthard, August 1, 1664, where the Austrian general Montecuculi defeated the famous Turkish Grand Vizier, Mahomed Kuprili; the result of this battle was the peace at Vasvár on August 10, the same year, which was so damaging to

Hungary that it caused violent manifestations against Montecucoli and the Emperor-King.

The best of the Habsburg generals, Prince Eugene of Savoy, called the attention of his Imperial master to the fact that the real power of the Habsburg was not in Vienna but in Buda. But the advice of this great soldier and statesman fell on deaf ears. The courtiers' skill in intrigue counterbalanced his sagacity. A few centuries later Bismarck gave the same advice to the House *am Baltplatz* (the Foreign Office of Austria) in his famous parliamentary address.

The Habsburg opposition to independent Hungarian interests aroused finally the anger of the Nobility and Clergy. Count Francis Wesselényi, Palatine of Hungary, and the Primate headed what is known as the Hungarian Fronde. Men like the Chief Justice of Hungary, Count Nádasdy, the Counts Peter Zrinyi, and Frangepani, and even Prince Francis Rákóczy, joined the malcontents. The importance of the Fronde grew, for the nobles won to their cause Louis XIV., King of France, through his friendship with Prince Rákóczy and his enmity toward the Habsburgs and, further, Apaffy the Duke of Transylvania; and the ever-ready enemy of the Habsburgs, the Sultan of Turkey.

Leopold I. (1657-1705), Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary, cruelly crushed the Fronde; and all the nobles captured were mercilessly hanged or beheaded and their fortunes confiscated. Counts Nádasdy, Peter Zrinyi, and Frangepani were tried by Austrian judges and beheaded at Wiener-Neustadt. Prince Francis Rákóczy was saved only by the intervention of Sophia Báthory, his mother, who, through the Jesuit Fathers, freed her son with a ransom of 400,000 gold forints. The action of the Hungarian Fronde cannot be called very fortunate, although it had a National character, because the repression of the Imperial house in avenging itself had terrible results for the country. In 1671 the "Bloody Tribunal" brought the most cruel sentences against Protestantism and Protestants. In 1673 Leopold abolished the Constitution of Hungary and placed the brutal Cardinal Kollonics over the subjected provinces; and Hungary was reduced to the rank of an Austrian province.

The result of the crushing of the Fronde was a long civil war. Such a nation as Hungary could not be treated like this. Soon the political parties united against Austria, and political bitterness gave rise to an unprecedentedly great literary movement in the country. Historians call this the expression of the

sentiment of a downtrodden nation. Most of the poems and songs of that age are still in existence in Hungarian literature; many of them are expressed in the internationally known Hungarian Rhapsodies, composed by the immortal Franz Liszt.

The leader of the malcontents, Count Imre Thököly, led three wars against the Habsburgs (1678-1682). In 1682 he was acknowledged as Prince of North Hungary by the Habsburgs and the Sultan of Turkey. In spite of the fact that Louis XIV. of France gave a great financial and military aid to the Protestant nobility of Hungary, the peace of the Habsburgs with Thokoly from 1681 was not lasting.

Through new intrigues in Vienna, Protestantism was again deprived of its freedom and the former situation repeated itself. Thokoly, with his reorganized army and with the aid of the Sultan, declared war on Leopold in an attempt to teach him to respect the constitution. Kara Mustafa, the Turkish Grand Vizier, with a picked army of 250,000, marched against Vienna. Thököly and his friends, however, realized that the object of the Turks was not the protection of Hungary from the Habsburgs, but the conquest of Vienna so as to dominate the whole Empire under Turkish suzerainty. Hungary and Thököly united once more, seeing the danger for Christianity —even more, the danger against the civilization of all Western Europe— and turned with concentrated energy to the defense of the Austrian capital, Vienna, which was then the secular capital of Christendom. The Palatine of Hungary with Thököly, and Charles, the Duke of Lorraine, formed three armies for the defense of Vienna. King John III. (Sobieski) joined the Hungarians, and the Turks were repulsed with great losses on September 12, 1683.

The Holy League was formed between Leopold of Austria, Poland, Venice, Moscow and the Holy See for the task (March 5, 1684), of driving the Turk back to the Balkans. By Hungarian valour Austria and Western civilization were saved once more.

This was the beginning of a sort of political union between Austria and Hungary, this time more of the nature of a military convention, and an agreement to drive the Turks from their countries. But in spite of the victories of Prince Eugene of Savoy and Charles of Lorraine over the Turks in 1687 at Mohács, Western Europe still could not feel free from the powerful enemy of

Christianity. The Turks were still very strong and could not be driven from all of Hungary. The Sultan sent ambassadors to France and soon succeeded in reversing the victories of Austria and Hungary. The new Turkish Grand Vizier, Mustafa Körpúli, attacked and retook in quick battles the cities of Nich, Widdin, Semendria and Belgrade. In 1690 Thököly became Prince of Transylvania. The Turk was beaten again at the battle of Zalankemen, August 18, 1691, by the Margrave of Baden-Baden. This was a decisive victory. The Sultan, seeing his power at stake, gathered a new army which he led personally. He was beaten by Prince Eugene of Savoy, Commander-in-Chief of the Hungarian, German and Austrian armies, at the battle of Karlowitz. The Sultan sued for peace, which was concluded in the same city on January 26, 1699. The Sultan was obliged to evacuate all Hungary and Transylvania.

This peace marks the reunion of long-separated provinces and a decisive victory over Mohammedanism.

Unfortunately, the victories over the Turks brought no relief to oppressed Hungary.

4. REACTION, REPRESSION, REVOLUTION

RISE OF THE HABSBURGS

By the beginning of the eighteenth century the Habsburgs had risen to power. The founder of the family''s greatness was Count Rudolf, who possessed vast stretches of property in Argau and Alsace. The Swabian nobility and electors of the German principalities placed Rudolf on the throne at Aachen (Aix La Chapelle). In 1282 the Habsburgs became Dukes of the provinces of Austria, and in 1526 Apostolic Kings of Hungary and Kings of Rumania. From 1438 to 1806 they were Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, and Kings of Germany; and from 1516 to 1700 they were Kings of Spain, holding many minor titles and controlling the Spanish territories in America. In 1804 they became Emperors of Austria.

The Habsburgs reached the height of their power in 1526 under Charles V., Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and King of Spain. It is from this period that the saying dates that “the sun never sets in the realms of the Habsburgs.” Their possessions included the Netherlands; the Dukedoms and Kingdoms of Naples, Sardinia, Sicily, Milan and Venice in Italy; Friland, Utrecht, Gröningen, and Gelderland in the north of Europe; the French Comté; parts of Alsace, the Tyrol, Voralberg, and Bohemia; and a great part of Hungary.

Two ruling houses of France, the House of Valois, and later the House of Bourbon, became formidable enemies of the Habsburgs, opposing their rule in Spain and engaging with them in the Wars of the Spanish succession. After the defeat of the Habsburgs in Spain by Louis XIV. of France in 1700, and the death of Philip of Spain, that country passed to the Bourbons in accordance with the Peace Treaty of Rastatt. At the same time the Habsburgs received the Italian Duchies of Mantua, Parma, Piacenza, Triest, Istria, Görz, Gradiska, Lombardia, and Venezia. They gained their large possessions mostly through fortunate marriages, rather than by their ability as statesmen or military leaders. (”Tu nube felix Austria!”, meaning “Make fortunate marriages, Austria!”.)

The greatest statesmen of the Habsburg family were Charles V. of Spain, Emperor-King Joseph II., his mother, Maria Theresa, and Francis Joseph I.,

all of these displaying great tenacity in holding power and territory, and early recognizing the importance of religion in their policies.

Habsburg policy aimed not only at driving out the anti-Christian Turk, but also at weakening the power of Hungary, and especially nullifying the old constitution, so jealously guarded by the National Assembly. The Hungarians alone were too weak to drive the Turks from the country, and were compelled to ask the Habsburgs for aid. In vain Count Peter Zrinyi called the attention of the National Assembly to the logical results of this intervention. Since Hungary could not exist without it, the nation had to bear the consequences. The Imperial troops of Austria remained in Hungary, by order of Vienna, after the defeat of the Turks, and were paid and maintained by the local taxpayers, the Hungarian peasants. The Austrian occupation was in many respects more disastrous to the country than that of the Turks. The country in those days was little benefitted by the Peace Treaty of Karlowitz, which subjected her to the yoke of Austrian tyranny.

One of the most despised characters in Hungarian history is the Cardinal Count Kollonics, Prince-Primate of Hungary, and one of the Emperor-King's most powerful advisers. His program was "to make Hungary poor, then Catholic, and finally German." With such a representative the Habsburgs could not even hope to conciliate Hungary. Despotism lay dark over the nation when the Austrian Count Caraffa was sent from Vienna. He was called the "hyena of Eperjes," a city in northern Hungary. Nothing was done in Hungary by the Vienna Government without the approval of Cardinal Kollonics, who was responsible for the massacres of General Caraffa in northern Hungary. In 1687 many Hungarian men and women of prominence, especially those of Protestant faith, suspected of anti-Habsburg sympathies, were beheaded by Caraffa without a trial. This was Cardinal Kollonics "hors d'oeuvre." As first adviser to the King he opposed the Hungarian nobles and prepared a way for a new and important law which would assure to the male line of the Austrian Habsburgs (without the necessity of election) the hereditary right to the throne of Hungary.

When this law was read in the Assembly of Hungary, its incorporation was urged because of the great service of the Habsburgs in freeing Hungary from the Turkish yoke. One part of the law contained the "sacred oath," according to which all provinces previously part of the Kingdom of Hungary must be returned to the territory of the Hungarian crown. Under this law, the

nine-year-old son of King Leopold, Joseph I., was crowned King of Hungary. (Without swearing of the oath and without a coronation no King of Hungary is recognized as constitutionally the King.) For a time it looked as if the law would strengthen the country, but intelligent people soon realized that Cardinal Kollonics was at work again. He introduced another law to limit the rights of the peasants, and to give the political power to the nobility and high clergy.

A new colonization policy provided that the south of Hungary must be inhabited by new citizens, especially by the people of Serbia, who received new privileges in 1691. Another part of the country, in the immediate neighbourhood of Budapest, was ordered to be populated with German farmers and war veterans. The descendants of these inhabitants are still there, peaceful and useful citizens of Hungary. The purpose of this policy was to develop elements which would be favourably inclined toward the Habsburgs—people who would accept them with more understanding than the stubborn, patriotic Hungarian nobility. King Leopold's purpose was to abolish the old Hungarian constitution. The Court in Vienna called the Hungarians "rebels," and was prepared to make the nation a province or vassal state of the Habsburg monarchy. Croatia and the Duchy of Transylvania were taken from Hungary, and, in spite of the King's oath, these two countries were incorporated into Austria as its provinces.

PRINCE FRANCIS R ; K [CZY

In 1691, the Hungarian Protestants were again cruelly persecuted. The peasants rebelled against oppression and remonstrated in vain to the Vienna government. But the rebellion brought forward Prince Francis Rákóczy, one of the most beloved figures in Hungarian history. He and his associates filled Hungarian literature and history with immortal chapters.

Rákóczy lost his father in early boyhood. His mother was the famous Countess Ilona Zrinyi, who later married Count Thököly, the national hero, whom she followed into exile. Young Rákóczy had been educated at Neuhaus in Bohemia in the famous School of the Jesuit Fathers. Cardinal Kollonics was the guardian of the gifted young Prince, who spent his vacations at the Court of Vienna, where he met and married the Princess Amalia of Hesse. After this marriage he received the confiscated properties of his father. However, Kollonics forbade him to wear the princely title, on account of his great

popularity among the Hungarians. Angered by the policies of Kollonics he joined the rebellious malcontents of Hungary.

Count Bercsényi, a famous Hungarian general, guided and influenced him at this time. But Rákóczy, corresponding secretly with Louis XIV. of France, found himself betrayed by General Longuevalin, in the Austrian service, who delivered his correspondence to Cardinal Kollonics. Rákóczy was captured in 1701 sand imprisoned in Wiener Neustadt, where his grandfather, Count Zrinyi, had been beheaded thirty years before. Kollonics advised the Emperor to execute Rákóczy, but his wife was able to obtain his release. They fled with his followers to Poland, where he was received with sympathy and where he renewed his connections with Louis XIV. With Polish and French aid Rákóczy succeeded in organizing a new army, which was joined by a great part of the Hungarian gentry, by Slovaks, and even by Rumanians, to fight against the Habsburg. Rákóczy's first operations were unsuccessful, but later he gave much trouble to the Emperor of Austria, who entered into peace negotiations with him; but in spite of the friendly intervention of England and Holland no settlement could be reached. In 1704 Rákóczy demanded the recognition of his election as Prince of Transylvania, but this was refused by the Emperor.

The defeat of Louis XIV. at Hochsteadt did not hinder the King of France from organizing a new campaign for Rákóczy against Austria in 1704. At the Assembly at Onód in Hungary, in 1707, he was elected by the Assembly in the presence of the French ambassador, as King of Hungary. But Rákóczy suffered serious reverses, due to the lack of money and to the plague which swept his army. It was not long, moreover, before Prince Eugene of Savoy returned to the Supreme Command of the Habsburg armies, and with the aid of General Marlborough of Great Britain he defeated Rákóczy decisively. Rákóczy fled to Poland again to meet Peter the Great of Russia, entrusting the command of his army to General Alexander Károlyi, with strict instructions relating to peace negotiations with the Habsburg General, Count Pálffy. Károlyi disregarded his instructions and settled with Pálffy to the advantage of the Habsburgs. The armistice was proclaimed with the slogan "No unnecessary bloodshed for Hungary." These negotiations led to the treaty of Szatmár, where on April 29, 1711, the army of Rákóczy laid down their arms getting full amnesty. Hungary received a promise of complete religious liberty, and the return of the ancient rights and privileges of the Magyar nobility. Rákóczy himself chose voluntary exile and left for Rodosto, with many of his loyal followers, as the guest of the Sultan of Turkey. Until his death, in 1735, he

hoped for an opportunity to return to Hungary as a liberator. His loyal companion, Kelemen Mikes, the writer, has left in his memoirs a glowing account of Rákóczy, the immortal.

As a reward for the treaty of Szatmár, the Habsburgs bestowed upon Alexander Károlyi the title of Count of the Holy Roman Empire, appointed him marshal of the Imperial armies, and aided him in gaining large possessions.

A few years later the Turks attacked again, but thIs time Prince Eugene of Savoy crushed the Turks decisively and dictated the peace treaties, in 1716 at Pétervárad, in 1717 at Belgrade, and in 1718 at Passarowitz, according to which the Turks returned Banat of Temes, North Serbia with Belgrade, and the present Rumania to the Habsburgs.

This victory of Prince Eugene is famous in history for the reason that this was the foundation of the later Habsburg power.

A central government in Vienna, with sub-governments called "Kammers," administered the newly-gained Slavic nationalities of the Habsburgs: the Banats of Temes, Bosnia, a great part of Serbia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia, Moldavia; to the East Wa!lachia (the present Rumania), Transylvania, and other provinces; in the North and Northeast Oppeln, Ratibor, Bukovina, Galicia, Illyria, Lodomeria, Moravia, Bohemia and Slovenia.

The victories of Prince Eugene, however, were not lasting: in 1739 the Habsburg armies were beaten again by the Turks and the Habsburgs lost several provinces. The new boundary lines became the Unna and the Szava Rivers.

HABSBURG DOMINION

After the Treaty of Szatmár, the country returned to normal life. After a short reign in Transylvania, Count Thököly left the country, and Transylvania came under Emperor-King Joseph's rule (1705-1711). He recognized the three parts of Hungary and the four Christian religions in his "*Diploma Leopoldinum.*"

Joseph's successor was his brother Charles III. (1711-1740). His advisers forced the Hungarian Assembly to introduce a new law, providing for the organization of a permanent army maintained by the Hungarian taxpayers. In this law, passed almost unanimously by the Legislature, the Hungarian nation accepted a single mutual defense system for Austria and itself. Members of the Assembly had little to lose, since the upper classes were exempted from taxation. It was the peasant who had to carry the burden of additional levies, as illustrated in the text of the law, "*Misera contribuens plebs*" (the official language of the Assembly was Latin), meaning "the common taxpaying people." Another law was also passed about this time, which forbade the peasantry to move. They were required to live and die where they worked. No choice of domicile was allowed to the man who carried the greatest burdens of the country—a condition which obtained in several other countries of Western Europe.

The King had absolute power. All offices were filled by his appointments. The only constitutional freedom guarded by the "counties" was the filling of certain offices by election every three years. This system was called the "Restoration," and through it the counties had power to counteract royal orders. The nobility and clergy, rather than taxpaying peasants, exercised this right of citizenship.

In 1722 the Catholic Church became the Church of the State. The Estates, which had come to believe that Catholicism was essential to true loyalty and patriotism, passed a law that only a Catholic prince could become King. Catholic magnates and prelates spent large sums on the endowment of schools and, as a consequence, Protestantism, the religion of a large part of the middle and lower classes, suffered. Restrictive laws were passed in 1731 and Protestants were excluded from public office. Nevertheless, Protestantism continued to flourish, with the support of a large proportion of the gentry; and the Emperor's alliance with England and Holland prevented the application of extreme measures of suppression at this time. In Transylvania, a country with a strong Protestant majority, the Vienna government, probably upon the advice of the Clergy, kept the Unitarians out of office and vetoed their membership in the legislature. In order to secure a good living or an office, people often changed their faith and became Catholics.

In earlier periods of Catholicism, especially under the rule of the first Christian Kings of Hungary, large donations were made to the Roman

Catholic Church. During the Habsburg reign, however, successful generals and loyal supporters of the ruling house received these contributions. The family of the Counts of Schönborn received from the Imperial treasury the confiscated estates of Prince Francis Rákóczy, Prince Eugene of Savoy, the Princes Esterházy and Pálffy, and many of the important nobles were rewarded for their services with the seized property of disloyal nobles.

However, some of the acts of the Vienna government operated for the general good. The system of a permanent army brought peace and opportunity for economic, agricultural, industrial and mercantile development. Instead of fortified castles, the wealthy nobles built beautiful houses with gardens and parks. Vast abandoned stretches of country developed into flourishing agricultural districts. Foreign merchants brought business prosperity. The needs of commercial transportation caused new roads to be laid. Hungary began to flourish again.

PRAGMATIC SANCTION

The Treaties of Szatmár and Madrid (Wars of the Spanish Succession) settled many questions of importance between Western and Central Europe. France and Spain were united under the Spanish line of the Bourbons, who made Holland a wall against the ambitions of Louis XIV. Through a shrewd home policy and diplomatic achievements, England became perhaps the greatest Power in Europe and because of her colonies the most feared maritime Power. Russia, too, came to the front as a great Power.

The failure of the Franco-Magyar-Russian alliance at the time of Rákóczy's insurrection, and the good offices of Queen Anne of England on behalf of the Prince, strengthened Habsburg power in Hungary. With no more than loyal assurances the Habsburgs guaranteed henceforth to respect the constitutional independence of Hungary.

The reign of Emperor-King Charles III.[1] brought peace and a certain contentment to the Hungarian people, especially to the higher classes. In

1 As King, Charles III., but as Emperor, Charles VI.

1712 the question of the succession of the female issues to the throne was brought up for discussion in the Assembly. In 1713 Charles issued a decree containing the pragmatic sanction which said: "Should the Emperor-King die without male issue, the succession to the throne goes to the oldest daughter of the said Emperor-King, etc., and only in the second and third line to the female issues of his brothers." At the time this manifesto was issued, Charles had no children, and the *"pragmatica sanctio"* was incorporated into the laws after the birth of his only child, Maria Theresa. It was made a law first by Austria, later by Transylvania, and in 1722 by the Hungarian Legislature. The object was to strengthen the ties between Austria and Hungary and their provinces, since Charles feared the disintegration of his empire after his death. The spirit of the law expressed the conformity of the Habsburg countries to its Latin motto, "Inseparabile et indivisible." And when the Emperor-King Charles died, the last direct male Habsburg ruler, he was succeeded by his daughter.

THE REIGN OF MARIA THERESA

Maria Theresa, who was married to Prince Francis of Lorraine, proved to be one of the wisest and best of the Habsburg rulers. Austria's neighbours had waited for the moment of her father's death to attack both Austria and Hungary. When the situation became desperate, the Queen in 1741 called the Hungarian Assembly to Pozsony. She appeared before the Assembly, her baby son in her arms, and with tears in her eyes she begged the nobles and prelates for aid against the enemy. Although many of those assembled opposed the Queen's government, their chivalry and sympathy were aroused by the weeping Queen, and they at once drew their sabres, exclaiming: "*Vitam et Sanguinem! Moriamur pro rege nostro, Maria Theresa.*" ("Our lives and blood for our Sovereign, Maria Theresa.")

Maria Theresa at all times expressed a sincere love and sympathy for Hungary. She was forced, however, to rule as did her predecessors, ignoring in most cases the Hungarian constitution. In spirit and sentiment she came nearer to the nation than had any of her family and she was the first Habsburg to call herself a good Hungarian in the presence of the Court. She appointed her consort Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, a meaningless title, since the Empire did not exist. After her marriage the dynasty was called the House of Habsburg-Lorraine. Hungary was governed by Maria Theresa's son-in-law, the Duke of Teshen and Saxony. The Queen's love for Hungary aroused the

jealousy of her Court, but she nevertheless invited the Hungarian nobility to Vienna as often as possible. She appointed prominent Hungarians to high offices in the diplomatic service and the army.

In 1714, the Hungarian Assembly passed a law under which the state was to be represented in the Imperial Cabinet. Latin was still the official language of the legislature, and was used because the Hungarians preferred their old customs to the German ones. After the death of Count Pálffy, the Viennese government forced the German language to be used in Hungarian regiments and others recruited by them. This system remained until the recent dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. As only German-speaking persons received commissions, many Hungarian officers resigned.

Under Maria Theresa's rule the central government tried to introduce a just tax system in Hungary. Since the nobles and prelates were exempt from taxation under the old system, they fought the proposed change vigorously, and, in spite of the fact that the central treasury needed money, vetoed the law in 1764. Upon the advice of the Vienna Government, Maria Theresa dissolved the Hungarian Assembly, suspended the constitution and the Palatine's office (Count Batthyányi), and appointed her son-in-law, Duke Albrecht of Teshen and Saxony, as absolute dictator of Hungary. The Queen used this long period of absolutism to free the peasants from their heavy taxes and to increase their political rights. She relieved them of the oppression of the nobility by issuing royal decrees without the sanction of the Assembly. While such decrees made Maria Theresa popular with the peasants, they angered the nobility and clergy, who insisted upon their old privileges, thereby creating antagonism in Vienna. The new state institutions of the Viennese government felt an increasing demand for money, and, since the nobility refused to pay taxes, the government, forced to gain an income elsewhere, levied heavy burdens on Hungarian industries and commerce. The principle of the Habsburgs was to operate a powerful monarchy with one strong central government, disregarding the national interests and traditions of the various races composing it. But Maria Theresa's rule on the whole was beneficial. Hungary progressed in agriculture, and peace prevailed. The influence of Maria Theresa was a spur to higher education, especially among the upper classes. Young men were sent to France, Germany, Italy, and above all to England, bringing home the new seeds of a higher national culture.

The Queen founded the first university in Buda, giving for its use the Royal Palace on the Danube. Later, under her son, Joseph II., the university moved into its own home in Pest. Hungary was then divided into ten educational districts, with a school for each community built on property contributed by the nobility and clergy. Under the Queen's rule, the Greek Catholic Church was divided into two parts—the United Greek Catholic Church (united with Rome) and the Orthodox Greek Oriental Church, of which the Tzar of Russia was the recognized head. With this division, the Queen weakened the influence of Russia, and the Tzar lost many adherents. Russia sought to regain these lost followers by circulating the theory that all her kindred Slavic races in the Balkans were logically Russian. As Apostolic Ruler of Hungary, Maria Theresa reorganized the status of the Roman Catholic Church, and expelled from both Austria and Hungary many Catholic Orders, including the Jesuit Fathers.

The Queen followed the old Habsburg policy of a dependent Hungary, but, when the dynasty's interests were not involved, she was always liberal. In 1772, she restored to Hungary the seven cities in the North, seized by the Imperial Treasury for unpaid taxes. The Banat of Temes and the seaport of Fiume were also returned.

JOSEPH II.

Upon the death of Maria Theresa, her son, Joseph II. (1780-1790), ascended the throne. Imbued in early youth with the ideas of democracy and liberalism, he found a stumbling-block in the constitutional privileges of the nobility and high clergy, but he planned to strengthen his power with the assistance of the masses, rather than with the support of the nobility. Because he would not take the prescribed oath to the Constitution, which meant respecting the privileges of the nobility, Joseph II. refused to be crowned King of Hungary.

He did not call the National Assembly into session, as was his privilege, since he had decided to fight the upper classes. His first step was the "Tolerance Edict" of 1781, according to which members of the Protestant and Greek Churches were admitted to the full privileges of citizenship and made eligible for offices in the provincial and Vienna governments. Although successful in Austria, the Tolerance Edict was not well received in Hungary. Because of Joseph II.'s edicts, especially his interference in Church matters, Pope Pius VI. made a trip to Vienna in an effort to persuade the King to revoke his laws

regarding the Church. He was received with high honours, but did not accomplish his mission. Joseph II. dissolved all Roman Catholic monasteries and convents, and brought the funds of the Church under the immediate control of the State.

In 1784, Joseph II. ordered the sacred crown of Hungary brought to Vienna, and introduced German to replace Latin as the official language of Hungary. This was a great political blunder and caused all classes to rebel. Imperial decrees also encouraged the minority nationalities (non-Magyar races in Hungary) in an uprising against the Magyars. A rebellion of the Wlachs in Transylvania, led by the peasants Hora and Kloska, was finally checked by the Hungarian nobility.

Although the Emperor-King always had the interest of the Hungarians at heart, his methods were often ill-advised. His dictates, made for the benefit of the people, often offended the State. In the end his social reforms benefitted the privileged classes, who were too short-sighted to realize that their immunities created bitterness and hatred among the oppressed masses. Joseph introduced new systems, through decrees, giving the peasants democratic rights, in accordance with the most advanced social theories of Western Europe. He realized that the peasants, and not the privileged classes, were the backbone of an agricultural country. For the first time in Hungarian history the King emerged as the leader of a democratic movement. Another royal edict authorized the peasants to choose their domicile freely, and abolished the *"Dominium-jurisdiction,"* under which each landowner had his own court of justice for the serf-peasants on his estate. The latter system prevailed all over Europe at that time and was one of the causes of the revolution of 1848, sixty-two years after Joseph's attempted social reforms.

The King's foreign policies did not make much progress. Frederick the Great prevented the exchange of Belgium for Bavaria. Nor did his wars with the Turks, even with the aid of Catherine the Great of Russia, meet with success. He died in 1790, revoking on his death-bed, on the advice of his Chancellor, Prince Kaunitz, all his decrees except those beneficial to the peasantry.

Joseph strove to bring about reforms and it is impossible not to admire his efforts although most of them came to naught. He chose for his grave the following epitaph: "Here lies a sovereign who, despite the purity of his motives, was unfortunate enough to have to witness the shipwreck of all his

schemes." (Michael Horváth, o.c.v. 440.) Another short but equally kind inscription records the fact that *"Sa1uti publicae vixit, non diu, red totus."*

After his death a party of the nobles, aided by Prussia, Poland and Turkey, elected Charles August, son of the Prince of Saxe-Weimar, as King of Hungary, but the strength of the Habsburgs prevented him from reigning.

LEOPOLD II.

Eventually Leopold II., the third son of Maria Theresa, who had succeeded his father, Francis of Lorraine, as ruler of the Duchy of Tuscany, became King (1790-1792). He married Maria Louisa, daughter of Charles III. of Spain. During his reign in Tuscany, the old stronghold of the Medici family, Leopold was known as one of the most successful administrators in Europe. He was cold and unusually reserved. The historian Fontenelle describes him as having had "a heart made of brains." When Joseph II. was dying, Leopold was called to his bedside. Despite his affection for his brother, Leopold did not leave his residence in Florence for some time, knowing that his brother was unpopular, and, as his successor, did not wish to share the unpopularity.

He came to the throne in 1790. The death of Joseph and the advent of the new monarch was celebrated in Hungary with a rebellion, during which all Joseph's decrees were burned. The Hungarian nobles refused to carry out the conscription and tax orders.

They planned to make new laws in the Assembly, limiting the power of the kings and annulling the Pragmatic Sanction. The popular cry was to refuse to crown Leopold IL The new King, however, did the unexpected. He called a session of the Assembly in Buda. The first royal order was to reinstate the Hungarian language in the schools and official life. In the *"Diploma Leopoldinum,"* be agreed to inaugurate a Hungarian Senate and to create a special national army, sworn to uphold the Constitution. (This had previously been guaranteed to Hungary by Prussia in an effort to check the Habsburg power. Enmity between the Habsburgs and Hohenzollerns had already begun.)

Leopold then began a new orientation in foreign policy. He and Frederick William of Prussia agreed at Reichenbach to return Belgrade and other territory in the Balkans to Turkey. Prussia and Turkey did not want a strong

Habsburg neighbour. When Leopold was assured that he had nothing to fear from Prussia, he started playing politics in Hungary. In the Assembly his agents played the Protestants against the Catholics, the Croats against the Hungarians. Leopold opposed the union of Transylvania with Hungary and favoured the Serbs and other non-Magyar races in Hungarian territory. On November 15, 1790, the opposition in the Assembly yielded and with a nation-wide celebration Leopold was recognized as the lawful successor to the throne and crowned King. He then declared himself war lord of the national army. His son, the Archduke Alexander Leopold, was elected Palatine.

New laws enacted by the Assembly recognized a king as lawful only if crowned within six months after his succession to the throne. The old rights of the nobility and clergy were re-established, but the free selection of domicile by the peasants remained. The Protestant Churches received more privileges; the Greek Orthodox Church was recognized; and with one exception, the Jews retained the rights allowed them by Joseph II.—they were forbidden to live in the mining districts. One of Leopold's most important decrees was the *"Placetum regium"* requiring his consent before any Papal edicts could be published in the Empire.

Leopold II. died in 1792, leaving sixteen children, among them Archduke Charles, who defeated Napoleon at the battle of Wagram.

FRANCIS I.

Francis I. (1792-1835), the next King of Hungary, was born in Florence, 1760, the son of Leopold II. and Maria Louisa of Spain. He was educated at the Court in Vienna, under the personal guidance of his uncle, Joseph II. In 1788, he married Princess Elizabeth of Wurttemberg, and in 1792 ascended the throne of Austria. The French Revolution and the appearance of Napoleon I. cast a cloud over Europe and temporarily halted the progress of social reforms. Francis was the first Emperor of Austria, having been forced to give up his title of Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire by the Confederation of the Rhine, composed of the German Kings and the reigning Princes.

Under pressure from Napoleon, in 1805, Francis dismissed his favourite chancellor, Prince Colloredo, and from then until 1809, when he appointed Prince Metternich to the office, he managed the government alone, attending to even the smallest details.Francis was merciless toward the advocates of

national freedom in Hungary and for leading this movement he had Martinovich, a Hungarian prelate, executed and his associates thrown into prison. The liberals who had been placed in office by his uncle Joseph II. were all dismissed and, despite the efforts of the Assembly, Hungary again sank into vassaldom.

Napoleon divorced his wife Josephine Beauharnais, and married the Archduchess Maria Louise, daughter of Francis I., in order to have a mother of royal blood for the heirs to the French throne. Napoleon's heir, the King of Rome, was brought up at the Court of his grandfather, Francis, under the guidance of Metternich. There he became the Duke of Reichstatt, and died when he was still young.

In the Napoleonic wars the Austrian armies were unsuccessful. General Cobenzel was defeated in 1805, and Count Stadion in 1809. In spite of these misfortunes, Hungary remained loyal to Austria. Napoleon issues a manifesto to the Hungarian nation offering her liberation from the Habsburg yoke, but it was not accepted.

Napoleon's Manifesto:

"It is the Emperor of Austria, not the King of Hungary, who has declared war against me. By your Constitution he had no right to do so without your consent... Hungarians, the moment has come to recover your independence. I offer you peace, the integrity of your territory, your liberty, and your Constitution . . . I want nothing from you: only to see you free and independent. Your union with Austria has been your misfortune. Your blood has flowed for her on distant fields, and your dearest interests have been continually sacrificed to those of the hereditary States. You formed the fairest portion of the monarchy, and yet were reduced to the position of a subject province, and made the sport of passions to which you were strangers. You have your national customs and a national language. You Boast of an ancient and illustrious origin. Regain, therefore, your national existence. Have a King of your own choice who reigns for you alone, who resides in your midst, who is surrounded only by you and your soldiers. Hungarians, this is what Europe, which has its eyes on you, what I also, ask of you: a lasting peace, commercial relations, and an assured independence. That is the price that awaits you if you are worthy of your ancestors and of yourselves. You will not refuse these liberal and generous offers. You will not squander your blood in the cause of feeble

Princes, ever dominated by corrupt ministers who are in the pay of England, that enemy of the Continent, which has founded its prosperity on monopoly and on our divisions. Meet, therefore, in your national Diet on the plain of Rákos, as your ancestors did, and let me know the result of your deliberations."

Napoleon did, however, create a new province of Illyria, in the south of Hungary, out of the provinces of Croatia and Fiume. In 1809 the French army occupied Vienna, and Francis was forced to transfer his capital to Buda. On June 14, General Beauharnais defeated the Austrian army led by the Archduke Joseph, Palatine of Hungary, at Györ. The defeat at Wagram compelled Francis to sue for peace, and the Peace of Schönbrunn (Vienna) was signed. Austria had contracted an enormous debt during the wars with France. In 1806 it amounted to 600,000,000 gold florins, a sum beyond the capacity of the entire Habsburg Empire. The Vienna government tried to force the Hungarian nation to participate in the payment of the debt but without much success.

Russia decided to take advantage of the weakened condition of the Habsburgs and in 1812 sent an army, under Admiral Chohanow, to invade Transylvania and Hungary. However, when Napoleon's army retired from Hungary, Russia abandoned her project and hastened to unite her forces with those of Prince Felix Schwartzenberg, Commander-in-Chief of the Austrian army, and the King of Sweden. The armies met on the outskirts of Leipzig, and with the aid of Hungarian regiments defeated Napoleon's concentrated forces.

The Habsburg policy toward Hungary remained unchanged. Hungary was allowed to build the Francis Channel between the Danube and Tisza Rivers, which facilitated transportation with Austria. New roads to Fiume were also completed. The Hungarian National Museum at Budapest was erected in 1807 with funds donated by Count Francis Széchényi. The Assembly voted to build the first Hungarian military academy at Budapest, although for some time the Viennese government would not grant permission for the enterprise. Prince Metternich, a shrewd diplomat, advised the Emperor-King to be more lenient with the Hungarians and persuaded him to allow them a government of their own; but this was a government without power. In reality Metternich himself controlled Hungarian affairs. He made an alliance with several European Powers called the Holy Alliance, in which Hungary did not participate. In 1821 the revolution in Italy seriously endangered the security

of the Habsburg Italian provinces. Upon Metternich's advice, Francis I. did not call a session of the Hungarian Parliament, believing that he could obtain money and soldiers without its endorsement. Royal commissioners were sent out with armed forces to obtain 35,000 recruits, but were unable to get either men or material. Metternich saw that he would not accomplish his aim by compulsion, and advised Francis to call the Parliament at once. He apologized to the assembled nobles and prelates for the "mistakes" made by his royal commissioners. He restored the Parliamentary government for the sole purpose of obtaining troops, but in so doing he aroused national feeling from a state of lethargy.

COUNT STEPHEN SZÉCHÉNYI

On November 3, 1812, during a later session of Parliament, Paul Nagy de Felsöbükk, leader of the opposition, complained to the Vienna government that permission for the establishment of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences had been delayed for two centuries. Count Stephen Szechényi, son of Count Francis Széchényi, then a captain of the Imperial and Royal Hussars and a member of the House of Lords, offered a whole year's income of 60,000 gold forms for the use of the new Academy. Several other members of the House of Lords followed his example and work on the Academy commenced. In the House, on November 8, Stephen Széchényi delivered an address, speaking in Hungarian for the first time and stirring up tremendous patriotic enthusiasm. The Palatine objected, demanding that he use the official language, but several other leaders followed Széchényi's example.

Széchényi, coming from a family long known for its generosity and patriotism, was a born leader. Metternich at once recognized his importance in the political arena, and had him recalled to his regiment, then stationed in Milan, Italy. Széchenyi chose to remain at home in the service of his country and resigned his commission. He went to England, Germany and France to study social conditions and politics in preparation for public service. Upon his return he formed a new liberal party and tried to create interest in social and political problems. He admired English institutions and used them as models for most of his reforms. In obtaining control of the House of Lords, he paved the way for a new and enlightened era. He was convinced that such political and economic relations as those of Hungary with Austria would bring ruin to any self-respecting nation. His example influenced many members of the

aristocracy to leave the Habsburg Court in Vienna and to undertake patriotic duties under his leadership.

In 1830, Széchényi published *"Credit,"* a brilliant survey of the economic situation and the needs of Hungary. Although a large landowner himself, and the descendant of a privileged family, he advocated the taxation of the nobility. Disturbed by Széchényi's success, Metternich again attempted to send him from Budapest. He commissioned him to investigate the waterway problem on the Danube, particularly at the "iron gate," where Hungarian territory ends. Széchényi went, but on his return was even more powerful than before.

In 1832, new national leaders appeared, including Francis Deák, Baron Nicholas Wesselényi, Francis Kölcsey, the poet, and the youthful but able Louis Kossuth. This awakening of interest gave Metternich a political headache. His misgivings grew, for he knew that a conscious evolution can easily become an irresponsible and even bloody revolution. He sought to check the movement, to divert the attention of the people by playing one nationality against the others. In the Habsburg provinces he sentenced Baron Wesselényi and Louis Kossuth to three-and-a-half years in prison, and Lovassy, an outstanding orator, to ten years. These men advocated freedom of speech and the press, rights heretofore unknown to Hungarians. In 1839, another session of Parliament was called. After sixty-six speeches and twenty-three written petitions, the Opposition in the Lower House, led by Francis Deák, sent a statement to Francis I. asking clemency for the imprisoned national leaders. A royal amnesty was granted on April 20, 1840. But the years of inhuman treatment in prison had broken Baron Wesselényi's health and his eyesight was gone; Lovassy had become insane; and only the vigorous Kossuth retained his health and spirit. While in prison, too, he had mastered the English language. To prevent the union of Transylvania and Hungary, Metternich tried to appoint the Archduke Ferdinand Governor of Transylvania. But the embittered members of the Transylvania Assembly, inflamed by the addresses of the blind Baron Wesselényi, elected Count John Kornis. Transylvania's next move was to unite with Hungary, a step which had been opposed by Austria since 1526.

In one of his famous books, Széchényi said: "Do not sit down in a corner and brood with your head down about the glorious past of Hungary, but help to pave the great road for a better future for the nation." He later wrote: "The

treasure of a nation lies in her educated brains," and "nothing stands still in this world; even Hungary has to go on. Onward Hungarians with real aims and decisions, and Hungary will be again!"

The national cry for freedom was not directed altogether against the Habsburgs. Many of the people knew that the decree signed by them in previous periods of history had been conceived and prepared by their advisers who felt no responsibility either to king or country. When Metternich realized that the nation had no quarrel with the Habsburg dynasty itself, he prepared to encourage a strong Hungary as a protection against the aggressive Balkan policy of Imperial Russia.

"The attention of Russia had been attracted to Hungary in 1831 by the openly expressed sympathy of the Magyars for the sufferings of the Poles. (The Polish-Hungarian friendship or the Hungarian-Polish friendship dates back for centuries. Several times it happened that Polish kings wore at the same time the Hungarian crown and vice versa.) Two years later the Tzar Nicholas told the Emperor Francis of Austria (also King of Hungary), in the presence of Prince Windischgrätz, that he was always at the disposal of the Habsburgs, and in 1837 he spoke of the possible necessity of armed interference in Hungary to suppress the rising spirit of democracy." (Marczali: *A. Legujabb Kor Története,* p. 720.)

The liberalists led by Francis Deák put through many reforms for the peasantry, but the agents of the Viennese government in the House of Lords sought to weaken their effect as frequently as possible.

Stephen Szechenyi engaged the Scottish engineer Clark to build the Chain Bridge (Lánczhid), the first bridge on the Danube between the old Buda and the modern Pest. The toll collected for the use of this bridge was the first tax paid by the nobility. In spite of the resistance of many of the peers, Hungarian was really introduced as the official language throughout the country. On previous occasions it had been permitted, only to be forbidden again, or restricted to certain offices of government. A little of the old Latin has remained in Hungarian, for instance the "servus," meaning your servant, still is used as a form of greeting. The conservative elements saw the ruin of Hungary in the abolition of the ancient language.

Charles Dickens, in his weekly journal, in 1870 devotes a most interesting chapter to the immediate cause of Stephen Széchényi's death. He wrote:

"Every month rendered more and more apparent the necessity of promptly pacifying Hungary, and the utter impossibility of inducing her to swallow M. Schmerling's constitutional sedative. It was then that Count Rechberg, the Imperial chancellor, sought an interview with the recluse of Dobling; who submitted to his Excellency the detailed project of a complete policy for the constitutional government of Hungary, in harmony with the rights and interests of the Austrian crown. Count Széchényi, said Count Rechberg, when he returned from this interview, has done well to select a lunatic asylum for his place of residence. His ideas are purely chimerical. Not long afterwards the great Hungarian perished by his own hand. Had he lived but a few years longer, he would have had the satisfaction of contemplating the complete realization of those ideas which were considered so chimerical in 1862.

"The immediate reason for his suicide was a visit and search by the Viennese police at his apartment in the sanitarium for insane at Döbling. Vienna still distrusted Széchényi. They took his correspondence. He wrote the Police Minister, Baron Thierry, asking for his letters. The latter answered in most insulting tones, telling Széchényi that he would no longer be allowed to shelter himself beneath the roof of a lunatic asylum and must be prepared to quit it at an early date. On April 8, 1860, Count Stephen Széchényi shot himself.

"One of Széchényi's friends describes the great Hungarian's desperate, dramatic agonies which he overheard: 'My life is defeated, my work is destroyed, this nation is doomed, all is lost.' Haunted daily and nightly by the visions of this fearful clairvoyance, he persuaded himself that it was he who stood alone responsible to God and man for the misery he foresaw. It was not Kossuth, for Kossuth wished what he was bringing about. Kossuth was not responsible. It was not the cabinet of Vienna, it was not the Hungarian people themselves: for who but a dreamer would expect a whole people, and a singularly impulsive people, to our speed time, and pass at one stride, without stumbling, from centuries of feudalism into the most experimental and complex form of modern society?

"It was not the Croats, who had been wronged by his countrymen. Nor was it Jellacich, who, whilst avenging the wrongs of his race, remained loyal to his

sovereign, and stood forth before Europe as the saviour of a great and ancient empire. It was Széchényi himself: he only who had murdered sleep. He was the culprit, for he it was who first disturbed the lethargy of the past, without being able to control the activities of the present, and who aroused the demon whom he could not command. So he reasoned. The reasoning was erroneous, but the error was that of a noble nature, and he pursued it with unflinching self-torture to its horrible conclusion..."

It is a fact that Stephen Széchényi, this immortal soul, whom the contemporary historian describes as "a gay-spirited laughing youth," had the capacity to recognize the sad lethargy of his nation—and had the ability to arouse that nation and to put her on the road of solid development.

After the death of Francis I. his son, Ferdinand V., came to the throne. Later Parliamentary leaders recommended to him an armed intervention in Polish affairs. Since Poland was Slavic, the Russian Government regarded this action as an interference in her foreign policies, and prepared an armed force to proceed against Hungary.

KOSSUTH AND SZÉCHÉNYI

When the old and proud throne of the Habsburgs commenced to totter, events in Hungary brought two great geniuses to the political horizon, Kossuth and Széchényi. Undoubtedly Kossuth was far the bigger of the two men; poor, but with unprecedented magnetic force and talent, he was a born leader. Kossuth had to work hard as a lawyer to earn his living, supplementing his income by editing his "*Parliamentary Record.*" Széchényi, on the other hand, was wealthy, high-born, conservative but in many ways progressive, and determined to make a solid fight for the development of Hungary. Széchényi, knowing Europe, knew that Hungary had to stand alone without money and allies in case of war or revolution against the dynasty. Kossuth knew it also, but his hopes were high. Széchényi knew that Europe of 1848 would not consent to the annihilation of the Austrian Empire, as this would have disturbed the balance of Europe. Both men knew that the Hungarian Treasury was empty except for two hundred millions of worthless paper Treasury notes.

On July 11, 1848, from his seat in the Chamber of Deputies, Kossuth said: "Citizens, the time for dreaming is over. At this moment we stand alone in the

world. Single-handed we are left to combat the conspiracy which has united against us all the sovereigns and peoples by whom we are surrounded. I repeat it. We stand utterly alone. Fellow citizens, are you ready to fight for your lives and liberties?"

In 1841 Széchényi had published in Budapest his book, *"People of the East,"* in which he predicted the coming revolution and accused Kossuth of ultra-radicalism. Kossuth answered this accusation nobly by calling Széchényi, in his historical publication (1841), "The greatest Hungarian." This rejoinder of Kossuth accompanied Széchényi beyond his grave; it went down in history. Széchényi had founded "The World," a daily newspaper in Budapest, in which Count Dessewffy, his chief lieutenant, had constantly attacked Kossuth, moreover, as a dangerous radical.

In 1845 Ferdinand appointed Count George Apponyi (father of Count Albert Apponyi) as leader of the Conservatives in the Upper House. Szechenyi joined this Cabinet. With his help, Metternich for a time maintained a conservative majority in Parliament. At the same time, through the medium of his daily paper, the *"Pesti Hirlap,"* Kossuth, whom the nation already recognized as its leader, developed a Liberal-Democratic program for the nation, and was joined by such outstanding statesmen as Francis Deák and Count Louis Batthyányi. The two political parties began a struggle for supremacy. The Conservatives, led by Széchényi and composed of the aristocracy, stood for the gradual development of social reforms. Kossuth, controlling the Liberal-Democratic Party, was the idol of the masses and fought for national rights with radical force and little respect for Vienna. Both parties wanted to free the peasant, but Kossuth wanted it done at once. (The Hungarian Parliament in 1840 granted political freedom and rights to the peasants.) In an attempt to break the power of Kossuth and his followers, Széchényi led the new Conservative Party. He failed in his purpose and George Apponyi resigned. From this time on (November 27, 1847) Kossuth was the dominant force in Parliament.

At the elections in 1847 Kossuth and Deák in their appeal to the nation, asked the voters to choose between Liberal-Democrats and Conservatives. The result was a sweeping victory for the new Liberal-Democratic Party. At the same time the writer, Baron Joseph Eötvös, formed another Party, the Centralists or Doctrinaires, and set forth his platform in the book "Reform."

Kossuth, in his speech of July 11, 1847, called attention to the threatening attitude of the Russian forces assembled in the Danubian provinces; and Lord Palmerston, Prime Minister of England, in an order to Sir Stratford Canning, British Ambassador to Constantinople, dated November 7, refers to the belief that the presence of those forces "is not wholly unconnected with the events which have been passing in Hungary, and that the Tzar has contemplated the possibility of his being asked by the Austrian government to restore order in Budapest."

Upon Metternich's advice King Ferdinand opened the next session of Parliament with the first address in Hungarian delivered by a Habsburg. Metternich had smelled the smoke of approaching battle.

On December 15, Kossuth addressed the House, saying, "The war, honourable States (members of the National Assembly) is fought not between the Hungarian government and the Hungarian opposition, and not between the political parties of the Hungarian Parliament. The war is fought between autocratic Austria and constitutional Hungary." On February 15, 1848, he said: "There will be no longer peace in the Parliament: there will be constant war until the bitter end."

On February 29, Metternich, called in diplomatic circles "the coachman of Europe," received the news by secret telegram from Baron Rothschild, the financier, "that the coach of Europe was turned over in Paris." The French Revolution of 1848 had broken out. Kossuth, recognizing at once the significance of the political situation, demanded the immediate appointment of a responsible Hungarian cabinet and also the granting of a constitution to the people of Austria. His address, on March 3, 1848, was not anti-Habsburg, for he said: *Only those thrones stand firm in the cyclone of history which are founded on the rocks of the loyal love of their people, and only the man who lives in freedom can be true."* This speech put the finishing touches on the fall of Metternich. It is memorable for the passage: *"Famous thrones upheld in wisdom have collapsed, and people have regained their liberty. A noxious mist envelopes us, and from the crypt of the Vienna government blows a wind that destroys our nerves and depresses our souls. The dynasty must choose between its own welfare and the maintenance of a rotten government. Bureaucracies and bayonets are miserable ties, and he will be the saviour of the House of Habsburg who will reform the system of government in a constitutional direction and found the throne of his august house on the liberty of his faithful people."*

The cabinet proposed by Kossuth was to be composed of members chosen from Parliament and subject to the will of that body. The central government was to take part in the session of the constitutional Parliament, giving an expression of constitutional democracy and a recognition that people, Parliament and government were one. The motion was carried by a large majority.

Széchényi, "feeling" that Kossuth had "blundered," tried to dissolve Parliament and introduce a temporary dictatorship, in order to save the nation from revolution. He did not succeed, and a revolution brought about the fall of Metternich in Austria and of Count George Apponyi in Hungary. Within a few months Count Széchényi was taken seriously ill and, temporarily losing his mind, was placed in an asylum near Vienna.

A parliamentary deputation sent by Kossuth to Vienna was received with a fanatic demonstration. Kossuth, still loyal to the Habsburgs, appeared before Ferdinand V. who granted his request to appoint the first responsible Hungarian Cabinet, which was composed of the following men: Premier, Count Louis Batthyányi, President of the Opposition-Liberal Party; Finances, Louis Kossuth; Justice, Francis Deák; Agriculture, Klauzál; Interior, Szemere (Liberals); and Foreign Affairs, Prince Paul Esterházy (Conservative); Communication, Count Stephen Széchényi; Secretary of War, General Mészáros; Public Instruction, Baron Eötvös (Centralist).

On April 11, Hungary became a constitutional kingdom and on April 25 Austria obtained a constitution. As a result of the efforts of Baron Wesselényi, Transylvania united with Hungary on May 28. Nobility and clergy were required to pay taxes, the peasantry were given complete freedom, a free press was upheld, the common people were admitted to office and even to Parliament, if eligible, and all religions were proclaimed free and equal. Hungary won her long struggle for constitutional independence and became a modern state after a bloodless revolution.

THE AUSTRIAN CAMARILLA AT WORK

The Habsburg dynasty had in Vienna a circle of advisers known as the Camarilla, which functioned as an invisible government, Under Ferdinand V. it was composed of the most reliable, wealthy *Aulic* members of the higher aristocracy from all the Habsburg provinces, and was almost entirely Roman

Catholic. Before the outbreak of the next Hungarian revolution, it operated through Prince Metternich, Prince Windischgrätz, a relative, and Prince Felix Schwartzenberg, the two latter being marshals of the Imperial army, Count Kolowrat, and Archduchess Sophie, mother of Francis Joseph I., who was the recognized head of this "invisible government." Those high personages, of course, being mostly neither officials nor members of Parliament, were not responsible either to King or country for what they advised. Ferdinand V. was a mere figurehead, made use of to put their orders into execution. It was this circle that Kossuth opposed.

Immediately after Kossuth had established the first constitutional government in Hungary, Prince Windischgrätz and Prince Schwartzenberg began political intrigues. They planned to break down the Hungarian opposition and destroy the power of Kossuth, with armed force if necessary. The members of the Camarilla felt their influence endangered by the new government. Baron Samuel Jósika, Chancellor of Transylvania, recommended that Baron Jellacich, a colonel in the Austrian army, he appointed Banus (royal governor) of Croatia. Count Kolowrat, the Czech member of the Camarilla, an expert in the problem of nationalities (the non-Magyar races in Hungary and the non-German races in Austria) instigated anti-Hungarian propaganda in the northern and western provinces of Austria. By circulating the doctrine that the Magyar race was the natural enemy of all others, he so inflamed the various nationalities that war was made easy.

In the July session of Parliament, Kossuth said: "The Austrian absolutism is hopelessly against our constitution." Declaring that Hungary was in imminent danger, he asked the nation for an independent Hungarian army of 200,000 men and for 42,000,000 gold forints. The motion was carried by a large majority.

After defeating the Italians at Custozza, the Vienna government was emboldened to demand absolute power over all Habsburg provinces. But the Hungarian Cabinet declined either to take any orders from Austria or to participate in the payment of Austrian state debts. Hungarian regiments were withdrawn from the Austrian army. The Camarilla had waited for just such a display of independence.

A panic broke out in Vienna. Court advisers saw that an independent Hungary meant the rapid fall of the Habsburg power. The weakness of

Ferdinand and his lack of authority over the Camarilla foreshadowed the coming catastrophe.

Kossuth's policy was still not anti-Habsburg, since he wanted Hungary to remain an independent kingdom under the dynasty. As far as the constitution permitted, other members of the Cabinet, Batthyányi, Deák, and Széchényi, were open to compromise, but the dissenting Kossuth dominated the Cabinet and it was impossible to formulate a definite plan of conciliation. Finally, the Hungarian Cabinet resigned in order to remove Kossuth. Acting on the advice of the Camarilla, Ferdinand accepted the resignations but did not reappoint a Cabinet.

Hungary was soon to experience Austrian treachery. Imperial officers had been dispatched to organize the Hungarian Serbs and their kinsmen from Belgrade against Hungary. The Hungarian War Office knew that native Austrian officers in Hungarian regiments could not and would not be loyal in a crisis. The moderate elements of the country dispatched a deputation to Ferdinand in an effort to bring about an amicable settlement. They also tried to reach an understanding with the Austrian Attorney General, Baron Bach, a Conservative leader. The Camarilla was opposed, and the mission failed. Then General Jellacich, Ban of Croatia, attacked Hungary with an army of thirty-six thousand. The Hungarian Parliament appointed a Committee for National Defense under Kossuth, who soon stirred the country into action. Volunteer regiments were organized and many boys of fifteen and sixteen and men over sixty joined the colours. Austria appointed General Lamberg[2]

2 Count Lamberg, a Magyar by birth but an Austrian at heart, was selected for the post of Envoy Plenipotentiary and Commander-in-Chief for Hungary. He was sent, in spite of the promises of the Austrian Government, "to abolish, if necessary by force, the responsible Hungarian Cabinet and therefore also the national independence." Kossuth pointed out that his appointment was illegal. The evening Lamberg arrived at Budapest an enraged crowd pulled him from his carriage and hanged him. The historian Hartig says "with this murder Hungary threw down the glove to Austria." But Knatchbull-Hugessen, the British historian, denies that Hungary could be held responsible for the murder of Lamberg by an excited mob even as Austria as a whole was not responsible for the subsequent murder of General Count Latour, the Austrian Secretary of War. However, this was the challenging point.

Imperial Commissioner for Hungary. Jellacich marched without a check into the heart of the country; for the Hungarian generals refused to attack him, despite orders from the War Office. Archduke Stephen, Palatine of Hungary, accepted command of the national army, possibly hoping to prevent bloodshed. He immediately sought a friendly conference with Jellacich. It was refused on orders from Vienna, and the Archduke, forced to choose between his kinsmen and his country, left the army for Vienna.

Kossuth tried to establish diplomatic relations for Hungary with the Powers of Europe. He failed because the nations had their accredited ministers and ambassadors for Austria-Hungary in Vienna. Furthermore, the Hungarian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Prince Paul Esterházy, lived in Vienna, where he also held an office attached to the King, the portfolio of a minister *a latere*. An old courtier, he did not take his membership in the Hungarian Cabinet seriously, and did not intend to take any steps against the Habsburgs.

To find a military leader to check the advancing Jellacich was a difficult task for the Hungarian government. General Moga finally repulsed his army near Budapest and the Austrian army retreated toward Vienna. The revolutionary troops pursued, and entrenched themselves near Vienna, where they were anxiously awaited as liberators by the Austrian revolutionists. On October 6, Count Latour, Austrian Secretary of War, was murdered by a mob in the Vienna streets. Ferdinand hurriedly fled with his Court to Olmütz in Moravia. Prince Windischgrätz was appointed Field Marshal of all the Habsburg forces, with the exception of those in Italy. Prince Felix Schwartzenberg, his brother-in-law, aided by Baron Bach, became the Dictator of the Habsburg monarchy.

Jellacich and Windischgrätz combined their armies and defeated the revolutionary army led by General Moga at Schwechat.

FRANCIS JOSEPH I.

Archduchess Sophia, the ambitious mother of the eighteen-year-old Archduke Francis Joseph, persuaded Ferdinand V. to abdicate in favour of his nephew, Francis Joseph I., who refused to recognize the Hungarian government, and attacked the country. As a result of anti-Magyar propaganda, revolts occurred, especially in counties populated by Rumanians, and were followed by the most cruel and terrible massacre of defenseless

women and children. Prince Windischgrätz took Budapest on January 6, 1849, and the Parliament moved to Debrecen. The Austrian general refused to discuss peace terms with the Hungarian deputation, saying: “I do not confer with rebels. I demand surrender without conditions.” Hungary lost Transylvania and the Banat in southeastern Hungary.

Unable to obtain enough military leaders at home, Kossuth invited the aid of foreign generals, and the Poles were the first to offer their services. One of them, Count Bem, later defeated Prince Windischgrätz’s generals, who was then in Transylvania seeking to recover that province.

Russia, looking with disfavour upon any Magyar-Slavic alliance, espoused the Austrian cause, aiming to discourage any further Polish participation in Hungarian affairs. The Tsar feared that a successful revolution would set a dangerous example and encourage an attempt to form an independent state composed of the three sections of Poland, Austrian-Galicia and German-and-Russian Poland.

General Bem vanquished the Rumanians and recaptured the Banat. Kossuth, overjoyed by these victories, introduced a bill into Parliament at Debreczen on April 14, 1849, to bar the Habsburgs from the throne of Hungary. The peace party, numbering among its members General Görgey, a revolutionist, opposed the bill. Kossuth was unanimously elected Governor of Hungary.

Meantime, at a meeting in Poland, Nicholas of Russia agreed to help Francis Joseph at once and ordered Prince Pashkievitch to advance with an army of 200,000. He invaded Hungary by way of the same passes in the Carpathian Mountains which were used sixty-five years later, at the beginning of the World War. The Austrian General Haynau was ordered to enter Hungary with a fresh army.

Hungary had no allies and her army was weakened and exhausted. Britain, the only sympathetic European nation, sent a note of protest through Lord Palmerston, her Secretary of Foreign Affairs. England did not approve of a too-powerful Russia.

General Görgey forced his way through the Russian lines and took a stand on the banks of the River Tisza. At the same time Haynau defeated Count Bern and Count Dembinszky in Transylvania. Kossuth appointed General Görgey

Dictator of Hungary and with his friends and adherents, among them many Polish generals and staff officers, fled to Turkey. With them they took the symbol of the highest power in Hungary, the sacred crown, without which Francis Joseph could not lawfully be crowned King.

The situation of the Hungarian army was desperate and Görgey knew that the revolution was lost. He was surrounded and completely cut off by the Austrian and Russian armies. In despair, he laid down his arms unconditionally before the Russian General Rudigers on August 3, 1849, in the city of Világos.

Once again Hungary experienced a catastrophe. Her sacrifices seemed in vain, and her zealous struggle for national independence appeared to be lost.

5. REVENGE AND REFORM UNDER FRANCIS JOSEPH

On August 13, 1849, General Prince Pashkievitch, Commander-in-Chief of the Russian forces, reported to the Tzar: "Hungary lies vanquished at the feet of your Majesty." "A slap in the face for Austria," says the British historian, Knatchbull-Hugessen, "which was not without effect on subsequent history."

Haynau, the Austrian General, was appointed Dictator of Hungary. Of his duties there, Knatchbull-Hugessen writes: "The 'sacred duties' apparently necessitated the inauguration by the butcher, Haynau, of a reign of terror and of a system of deliberate brutality which finds its parallel only in the horrors perpetrated by another agent of the Habsburgs . . . Caraffa."

On October 6, 1849, thirteen Hungarian Generals were put to death at the Fort of Arad. These "Martyrs of Arad" were: the Generals Aulich, Damjanics of Serbian birth, Alexander Nágy, Count Vécsey, Török, Láhner, Knézics, Poltenberg, and the German Count Leiningen-Westerburg, a cousin of the Queen of England, and the Generals Lázár, Dessewffy, Kiss and Schweidel.

On the same day, Count Louis Bátthyány, who had taken no part in the revolution and who as a Prime Minister had done his utmost to find a peaceful solution, was condemned to be hanged like a common criminal, to satisfy the personal revenge of the Austrian Prince Schwarzenberg and the Archduchess Sophie. Count Batthyány attempted suicide but was dragged from his dungeon to the prison wall where he was shot by a firing squad. Knatchbull-Hugessen writes in his book: "The Political Evolution of the Hungarian Nation": "He was shot a few hours later (after the attempt at suicide) and the 'damned spot' which his murder left on the Imperial crown of Austria can never be washed away."[1]

General G`rgey was saved from death for surrendering the army, but was thrown into military prison in Klagenfurt, Austria. As a tribute to the thirteen generals, the Hungarian nation set aside October 6 as memorial day. The ninety-year-old Baron Sigismund Perényi, the Democratic President of the House of Lords, was also shot by the firing squad in Budapest at Haynau's orders. Further,[2] forty-nine persons were hanged and sixty-five were shot and

hundreds of distinguished patriots were thrown into the military dungeons to satisfy the vengeance of the Austrian Camarilla.

Francis Joseph, however, dismissed Haynau soon and shortly after on a vacation in England he was attacked by a mob in London. Count Colloredo, the Austrian Ambassador to the Court of St. James, appealed to the British government for an apology, but Lord Palmerston refused to give it.

"If the advisers of the very young Francis Joseph had placed their confidence in a statesman instead of a butcher," said Knatchbull-Hugessen, "a permanent system of centralization might possibly have been established, but organized brutality was answered by a dogged passive resistance and engendered a hatred which only the lapse of many years could eradicate."[3]

Austria and Russia pressed the Sultan of Turkey to extradite Kossuth and his many adherents. The British Cabinet protested against this in a note to Turkey and sent her Mediterranean fleet, commanded by Admiral Parker, to the Dardanelles, placing it at the disposal of Sir Stratford Canning, British Ambassador at Constantinople. Canning's instructions were to enforce under any circumstances the decision of the British Cabinet: that Turkey give a

1 For his mock trial and the refusal to allow him to call for the evidence of the late Palatine, the Archduke Stephen, as to the part he had played, Friedjung, the prominent Auatrian historian writes, o.c.i., p. 228, sqq. and Appendix X.: "No one among the blood-drenched martyrs for the freedom of Hungary deserves a bigger sympathy than Count Louis Bátthyány does. . . . He devoted, almost until the last minute of his noble life, his entire knowledge, his heart, his patriotism, to the Solution of the problem of an understanding between the Viennese Court and the Hungarian Revolution, in spite of the malice and passion which he met on this thorny road of pacifying the two parties. This 'trial' carried out by the Austrian government against him is an everlasting dishonour on Austria. It is absolutely clear that the sentence against Count Batthyány was carried out against the better conviction of the judges, upon higher orders."

2 Consul General Fonblanque, Despatch 323 to Sir Stratford Canning, says: "There may have been technical palliation for the execution of forty or fifty officers; but I can conceive no such excuse for such facts as the arbitrary sentence that Mme. — should sweep the streets of Temesvar, or the far more revolting outrage of having caused Mme. to be stripped, and

reliable asylum to Kossuth and his followers who sadly needed this protection, for without it they would have been at the mercy of Austria. With British guns in sight the Porte decided not to deliver the fugitives, and Austria and Russia withdrew their demands.

In 1851 President Taylor invited Kossuth to visit the United States as the guest of the nation, sending the frigate "Mississippi" to Turkish waters for him. He embarked with his adherents on December 11, but left the ship at Southampton to deliver addresses in England.

He was well received there and later continued his journey with other Hungarian refugees to the United States. New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia and other cities extended a warm welcome, both Houses of Congress gave him a public reception; but Webster, the Secretary of State, refrained from committing the United States to any formal action. When Kossuth left the country in the summer of 1852, he had collected only a small amount of money ($100,000) despite the popularity and enthusiasm with which his republican ideals had been received. Before his arrival in the United States, Henry William Seward, the American statesman and writer (in the Lincoln Administration the Secretary of State), delivered an address before the United States Senate against the Imperial Russian invasion of Hungary in 1848. He was a powerful moral supporter of the Hungarian revolution against the

in that state flogged by soldiers just after her husband had committed suicide. There are also reports of a secret execution and of the sudden disappearance of persons. The Russian agents have, I understand, complained energetically against this cruel system. The Hungarians dread the departure of the Cossacks from the country." "A more eloquent testimony to Austrian brutality than this last sentence could not be imagined," writes Knatchbull-Hugessen. "The opinion of the British 'man in the street' was sufficiently indicated by the fact that when Haynau subsequently visited Barclay & Perkins Brewery in London, the employees as soon as they became aware of his identity beat him severely."

3 It is a question how far Schwarzenberg wss responsible for Haynau's brutalities. He is said to have replied to a suggestion that a merciful policy should be adopted with an eye to the future, "That's all very well, but first we want to do a bit of hanging." Friedjung, Wessenberg's criticism of Austria: "Revolutions are such moral sicknesses of nations as cannot be cured with the scaffold."

Austrian oppression and he was one of the great Americans who prepared for the visit of Kossuth.

The Camarilla, notably Windischgratz, Schwarzenberg, and the Archduchess Sophie, appointed Bach to govern the defeated rebels. He again instituted the German language in all offices and courts and attempted to transform the Hungarian people into Germanophile Austrians. Autonomy was cancelled, and Hungary for the time being ceased to exist as a national State. Bach's men were placed in all offices, and patriotic Hungarian officials were put in prison; Hungarian officers were ordered to serve as privates in the Austrian army. Everyone who could left the country.

One of those many famous "privates" was Baron Frederick Podmanitzky, later speaker of the House of Representatives of the Hungarian Parliament. Baron Podmanitzky, as an officer of a Hungarian cavalry regiment, shared also the destiny of others forced into the ranks of the Austrian army. He was a rich man, but he took his sufferings humorously. He ordered one of his famous coaches to follow behind the regiment, and during rest periods on marching expeditions would invite others in the same predicament to share the fine wines he transported in his coach. The privates of the Austrian army had a far higher respect for this Hungarian magnate who served with them than for their officers and, fearing that such cases would demoralize the troops, "those rebellious Hungarian privates" were discharged and sent home.

Oppression united all classes, and the Hungarian patriots were later joined even by the non-Magyar races, so great was the hatred of the tyrant. Even Count Stephen Széchényi, "after years of mental and nervous collapse made a momentary literary appearance before the world for the purpose of exposing in all its shameless nakedness the disgrace of all the despotism of which his country was the victim," says Knatchbull-Hugessen. "Bach," says Széchényi in his book "Blick" (View), "was keeping Francis Joseph in a fool's paradise and was deliberately deceiving him by talking of the freedom of the press, the equality of all before the law, the contentment and prosperity of Hungary and the gratitude of the Magyars for the murder of their brothers, for the hangman and the turnkeys of Austrian tyranny and for the disruption of their old Kingdom. Hungary was only beginning to be really united, to forget class and political distinctions; and a thousand gallows would fail to compel the Magyars to give up their language, the chief national treasure, or to abandon their hopes." Further, Széchényi writes: "A lonely, helpless, feeble man may

take his own life, if he can help himself in no other way, but nations commit suicide least of all when others attempt to compel them to do so . . . and no power on earth is capable of tearing out of the heart of a Magyar, or of lessening in the slightest degree, the feeling of love for his nation." "According to Bach," says Széchényi, "the Magyars had nothing to do but to obey, be silent . . and rejoice." It was soon after this that Count Széchényi committed suicide in his "living grave," as he called the sanitarium.

Baron Nicholas Jósika, a member of Kossuth's National Defense Committee and a great writer often referred to as the Hungarian "Sir Walter Scott," escaped from the gallows of Haynau to Brussels, going later to Dresden, where he and his wife, the famous Hungarian authoress, Baroness Julia Podmanitzky, fostered a literary movement. Count Julius Andrássy (the elder)—later Premier of Hungary, [and then foreign minister of the Empire]—and Count László Teleki, although under Austrian death sentence, continued patriotic activities in foreign lands. Another group of Hungarian patriots, headed by Pulszky, went to London.

In 1859 the defeat of the Austrian armies at Magenta and Solferino proved that the system of Bach could no longer prevail. Before the peace of Villafranca was signed, Count Rechberg, the Austrian Secretary of State, asked Baron Samuel Jósika for his advice. Jósika said frankly "that the old constitutional Hungary must be restored to her previous position (before 1848), which guaranteed the unity of the dual Monarchy and a safety which would otherwise be seriously compromised."

While Austria was losing her war in Italy, Kossuth, still working for an independent Hungary, went to Paris. He asked the aid of Napoleon III., .who promised much but gave nothing. He held several conferences with the King of Sardinia and Cavour, the Italian statesman. Encouraged by them, he prepared a plan for a new Hungarian revolution. On another visit to England his speeches won over the English press and public opinion, but no aid was given to him. Almost broken in spirit, Kossuth, as a last resort, tried to organize the Serbs and Rumanians against the Habsburgs. He failed and abandoned politics, retiring in permanent exile to Turin, Italy, where he died in 1894.

With the outbreak of the Crimean War, Russia was unable to continue giving Austria active support (the Balkan nationalities along the Danube started a

movement for freedom and Rumania became the first independent state). In Italy, Savoy and Lombardy engaged in war with Austria. The greater part of Italy had been liberated after the Austrian defeats, forming Modern Italy in 1859 and 1860 and with the formation of the German Union (1871) Austria lost her German territory.

Defeated by Prussia at Koniggratz in 1866, Austria turned now to Hungary for conciliation. Francis Joseph realized that the autocratic policies of Schwarzenberg and Windischgrätz would eventually ruin the dynasty and called a session of the Hungarian Parliament.

FRANCIS DEAK (THE COMPROMISE OF HUNGARY WITH AUSTRIA)

In exile, Francis Deák, a member of the constitutional Cabinet of Batthyány, devised a new political compromise providing for the union of Austria and Hungary under one king, with an independent Parliament and Cabinet for each country. Upon the urgent request of Francis Joseph I., he made frequent visits to the palace in Vienna and had frequent audiences with Queen Elizabeth, the wife of Francis Joseph, who learned to speak Hungarian and took an earnest interest in the affairs of the nation. Deák's compromise (a sort of treaty), made public on April 15, 1865, was accepted by Francis Joseph. Deák truly acted in the interest of Hungary, for the compromise was a wise measure at the time. The revolution was over and the country needed a chance to rebuild.

Deák was undoubtedly the outstanding man of that period and he tried to do the best for the country. But there were several different contemporary opinions, especially that of Kossuth, who thought that after the defeat of the Austrian army at Koniggratz, Deák should have been able to achieve far more for Hungary than a compromise and that he had missed the real opportunity to make the best out of the situation given by history into his hands. Kossuth from his exile made a last attempt to prevent the ratification of this compromise with Austria and addressed Deák in an open letter which was distributed on the streets of Budapest, expressing surprise that the defeat of the Austrians decreased rather than increased the demands for the freedom of Hungary. In this famous letter Kossuth tells Deák that he digs the grave of Hungarian independence and begs him to reconsider the wording of his

document before it is too late. “If I cannot carry with me to the grave the tranquilizing consciousness of success,” writes Kossuth, “at least let me be accompanied by hope for the future of my country. I know that Cassandra’s role was a thankless one, but remember that she was a true prophetess.”

Deák, however, left the answer of this letter to his friends Sigismund Kemény and Francis Pulszky. These two men took up Kossuth’s challenge and tried to convince him that his own plan, “a confederation of the Danubian states,” would be far more grave and dangerous to the cause of Hungarian independence and the supremacy of the Magyar Hegemony in Hungary than a treaty or compromise founded on the principle of absolute parity with Austria.

ANDR ; SSY (1823-1890)

“The Statesman of Providence, given to Hungary by the grace of God.”—Deák.

Count Julius Andrássy was born at Kassa, Hungary, on March 8, 1823, the son of Charles Andrássy. Absorbing the liberal atmosphere of his home, he rose to prominence among the Oppositionists at an early age. Coming under the influence of Kossuth, he advocated the aims of his party with zealous speeches in the National Assembly. At the outbreak of the revolution, he organized the youth of his county against Jellacich, and took an active part in the battles of Pákozd and Schwechat as General G`rgey’s aide-de-camp. After the failure of the Hungarian revolution, he was sentenced to death, and he fled to London, where he studied the British Constitution and the system of government. He later went to France, and returned to Hungary in 1858.

Acting on Francis Deák’s advice, Francis Joseph appointed Andrássy Premier of the new Hungarian constitutional government, and he later became Austr,ian and Hungarian Minister of Foreign Affairs, originating new policies in regard to the Balkans and Germany. With Bismarck, who admired his great ability and magnetic personality, Andrássy drew up the “Zwiebund,” an offensive and defensive treaty with Germany, and represented Austria-Hungary at the Congress of Berlin in 1878. With the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Austria and Hungary gained new power in the Balkans, arousing the fear and envy of Serbia which, as a Slavic country, was under Russian protection. Andrássy’s influence was felt at the Treaty of San

Stefano (1878) after the Russian-Turkish war. While Bismarck was laying down the German policies in Central Europe, Andrássy began building up Hungary. Bismarck and the British government would not allow Russia to occupy the territories won in the war with Turkey. With British help, the Congress of Berlin gave Andrássy a mandate for Austria-Hungary to occupy and administer the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina for some years. This action created in Russia a hatred for Germany and Austria-Hungary that was one of the underlying causes of the World War.

According to the Hungarian constitution, on June 8, 1868, Francis Joseph and Elizabeth were crowned in the old Matthias Church at Buda, near the Royal Palace.

The new compromise of Ausgleich in 1867, accomplished by the acceptance of the principles of the Pragmatic Sanction, provided for a division of the whole Habsburg dominion into two autonomous parts: (1) the Empire of Austria, and (2) the Kingdom of Hungary, including Hungary proper, the kingdom of Croatia-Slavonia, and the principality of Transylvania. Francis Joseph assumed the joint title of Emperor of Austria and Apostolic King of Hungary. For purposes of common action there was to be a joint Ministry, appointed by the Emperor-King, for the departments of (a) Foreign Affairs, (b) Army, and (c) Finance. There were to be ten-year treaties in regard to trade, tariff, public debt, and railways. And there was created a joint parliament known as the Delegations, representing each of the two separate States, to supervise the work of the joint Ministry and to promulgate laws affecting the common interests of the two realms.

All local affairs were to be managed by independent legislatures, and executives were to be appointed by the Emperor-King with the advice of the respective responsible Prime Ministers.

At the same time, the Hungarian Constitution of 1848, which had been in abeyance since the suppression of the Magyar insurrection of 1849, was in 1867 restored in its essentials for the regulation of the central government in the Hungarian half of the Dual Monarchy. This was indeed a fulfillment of the great work of Louis Kossuth for Hungarian independence and freedom, presented in the compromise.

There were many new reforms. Educational and liberal laws for the benefit of the non-Magyar races in Hungary were introduced, and the Jews were emancipated. The Department of Justice was separated from that of Administration. A system of State railways was established. Military training for three years was made compulsory, except for high school graduates who were required to serve one year only, and became officers in the reserve after an examination. In addition to the joint army commanded by the Emperor-King each country maintained a separate army for national defense, the use of which was not permitted outside the country's boundaries without the permission of the respective parliaments.

Under Francis Deák and Andrássy, Hungary began a healthy modern development. The customary Hungarian gift of coronation to the King and Queen was returned by them to the Hungarian pension fund for disabled veterans of the revolution.

Russia's ambitions were not in accordance with the British and German political ideas, and to check them Bismarck aided Andrássy in forming an Austro-Hungarian hegemony in the Balkans. On June 28, 1881, Andrássy secured an alliance with Serbia, and on October 30, 1883, one with Rumania. In 1887 Prince Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, an officer in the Austro-Hungarian army and a friend of the Dual Monarchy, became ruler of Bulgaria. His predecessor, Alexander, Prince of Battenberg, had been the victim of Russian intrigue, which obliged him precipitately to resign.

The various races in Hungary were not so difficult to govern, since Russian propaganda had not made rapid headway. The Dual Monarchy was made up of the following nationalities:

- 12,050,000 Germans, in upper and lower Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Western Hungary, Transylvania, and Banat.
- 10,200,000 Magyars, in Hungary and Transylvania.
- 8,500,000 Czechs, in Bohemia and Moravia, and Slovaks in North Hungary.
- 4,000,000 Ukranians in Eastern Galicia and Northeastern Hungary.
- 5,070,000 Poles, in Eastern Silesia and Western Galicia.
- 1,390,000 Slovenes, in Southern Styria, Southeastern Carinthia, Carnicla, and the coast-land.

- 2,675,000 Serbs, in Southeastern Croatia, the annexed provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, some parts of the Banat, the county of Bacska to the south of Hungary.
- 800,000 Italians and Ladins in South Tyrol, Triest, Trentino, Dalmatia and Fiume.
- 3,000,000 Croats in Croatia, Dalmatia and the annexed provinces.
- 3,250,000 Rumanians, in parts of Transylvania and Banat.

The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy collapsed after the World War and was dissolved in 1918 by the Treaty of Trianon.

The Dual Monarchy covered an area of 264,062 square miles and had a population of 52,000,000.

Hungary had a population of about 21,000,000 and an area of 325,121 square miles, including Croatia, Slavonia and Transylvania. More than half of the population were Magyar. After the collapse of the Monarchy in 1918 and the signing of the Treaty of Trianon, June 4, 1920, the territory of Hungary was divided among the following states, reducing the remaining population to 7,500,000 in the following proportion: Hungarian, 88.4%; German, 7%; Slovakian, 2.2%; and about 110,000 Croatians, Rumanians and Serbians.

Because of her many races, Austria had long been condemned to a political death. It was impossible to enforce the Constitution. The German elements were the leaders in

	Area in sq. km	Total Population	Magyar Population
Czechoslovakia	62,937	3,578,688	1,084,000

culture and commerce, but were overpowered by the non-Germans who held sway in industry and politics. Hungary was stronger, because the Magyars had complete control and the parliamentary atmosphere was healthy. Metternich and Andrássy were the last statesmen able to manage these racial problems successfully. Yet the political and economic existence of the various nationalities could have been better assured by

an amicable understanding of their needs. A federation on this basis was Kossuth's idea.

The Pan-Slav policy of Imperial Russia was originated by Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great. Cherished through centuries by diplomats and Tzars, it became the standard Russian foreign policy. As head of the Eastern Orthodox Church, the Tzar exercised religious power, which enabled him to influence church members outside his political realm. The Foreign Office in St. Petersburg created an enormous fund to carry on propaganda abroad. This and the autocracy's oppressive internal policy led to the Russian revolution and the establishment of a new system of living throughout the country.

Bismarck's enmity toward Russia began during his four years as German Ambassador to St. Petersburg. He discovered that Russian policies were hostile to his own country and to Austria-Hungary. Mastering the Russian language, he was able to understand clearly the national point of view. In Andrássy, he found a sympathetic ally, and it was due to their efforts that, in spite of her victory over Turkey, Russia could not dictate the terms of the treaty of San Stefano.

At this time, 1899, Crown Prince Rudolf, the only son of Francis Joseph I. and heir to the thrones of the Dual Monarchy, committed suicide at Meyerling, a hunting lodge near Vienna. The next in line, Archduke Francis Ferdinand, nephew of the aged monarch, was unpopular, principally because of his morganatic marriage with the Countess Sophie Chotek. Liberal Hungarian statesmen shared the general dislike of him, for he defined the Russian Balkan policy as a "Slavophile Home Politic."

In accordance with Andrássy's policies, the succeeding Imperial Ministers of Foreign Affairs continued to maintain friendly relations with the Balkans. Russia could not tolerate the spirit of amity existing between Milan Obrenovich, King of Serbia, and Austria-Hungary and forced him to abdicate in favour of his son Alexander. The new monarch suited the powers in St. Petersburg no better, and he and his wife were murdered in the Royal Palace. Peter Karageorgevich, the selection of the Russian Foreign Office, then became king.

At the outbreak of the World War, "national committees" were formed by citizens of Russian sympathies among the non-Magyar races in Hungary and

the non-Germans of Austria. During the War many soldiers and even whole battalions and regiments, mostly Czechs, left the Austro-Hungarian army to join the Russians. At the end of the War, several hundred thousand of such deserters were operating as independent units on the Russian fronts.

Count Michael Károlyi, leader of the independent party in the Hungarian Parliament, an advocate of the complete separation of Austria and Hungary, was detained by the French authorities in Paris on his way home from the United States. He had collected $70,000 from Hungarian-born American citizens. Going to Hungary when liberated, he enlisted in the army, spending some time at the front with the First Royal Hussars. During and after the war, he agitated for the separation of Hungary and Austria, and brought forth day by day more ideas which tended toward the ruin of Hungary.

After the assassination of Francis Ferdinand, his nephew, Charles, became heir and, on the death of Francis Joseph, ascended the throne. Charles IV. selected for his first adviser Count Czernin, Secretary of Foreign Affairs, who represented the policies of Francis Ferdinand.

The universal franchise was introduced into the Dual Monarchy. The Hungarian Wekerle Cabinet resigned, and Tisza, Apponyi, and Julius Andrássy, Jr., formed a parliamentary compromise with their political parties to avert the collapse of Hungary. Tisza attempted to make peace in 1915, 1916 and again in 1917, but was unable to move the stubborn leaders of the German military party.

On October 17, 1918, Charles IV. of Hungary (Charles I. of Austria) issued a manifesto stating that the Austrian Empire had been changed to the Federal States of Austria, each with an independent government under one ruler. On the same day, Tisza, addressing the Hungarian Parliament, said that the war of the Central Powers against the Allies was lost and that Hungary's only connection with Austria in the future would be their mutual monarch. All other matters of government, the Departments of Finances, War and Foreign Affairs, would thenceforth be separate and independent.

Several unsuccessful Cabinets followed those of Tisza and Wekerle. Contrary to Tisza's advice, Charles IV. appointed as Premier of Hungary Count Michael Károlyi, who had no governmental experience, and who brought Hungary to its ruin.

6. THE WORLD WAR AND AFTER

SOLDIER AND DIPLOMAT: A PERSONAL INTERLUDE

From the beginning of the World War to the summer of 1917, I spent more than three years in active service as a Captain of the First Royal Hussars of the Hungarian army. My regiment was ordered to the northeastern front to check the onrushing Russian army on the right wing of the Polish-Galitzian front.

The Carpathian Mountains presented natural obstacles to the warfare of both defenders and aggressors. In the deep valleys between the towering peaks the troops were subjected to terrible sufferings. The Hussars disposed of their horses; they could be of no use to them in such circumstances. It was necessary to mount guns in deep snow and sometimes in almost bottomless mud. Military transport with food and ammunition reached the firing line days behind the time table because the route led over narrow and hazardous mountain passes that were under the constant heavy fire of the Russian artillery.

While I was in another section of this front, I came in contact with Colonel Stromfeld of the Chief of Staff; he it was who, in 1919, after the Great War, took over the supreme command of the Red Army during the short Bolshevist reign in Hungary; and he it was who led the small, disorganized Hungarian Red Army in the offensive against the Czechs. When he had driven them back and victory was assured, the attack was stopped by Clemenceau's note to the Bolshevik Government forbidding the Hungarian army to go further north. So was established the so-called Clemenceau front.

In the summer of 1917, at the instance of the Vienna Foreign Office, I was ordered by the Supreme Command to leave the front and to proceed at once to Vienna for further instructions regarding an important military-diplomatic mission. Although 1 knew that I was to go to Berlin as an attaché to the Military Envoy of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, I did not learn the exact nature of my work until I had arrived in Vienna. There I was informed that my official title was to be that of a Press Attaché of the Austro-Hungarian Military Envoy; in reality, I was to be a sort of diplomatic publicity manager for Austria-Hungary. My task was to disentangle the political difficulties

arising from the unfriendly attitude of the German press toward its weakening ally.

There had in truth been considerable friction between the German Empire

and the Habsburg Monarchy. In 1917, after three years of war, the Dual Monarchy showed signs of weakening; the longing for peace had found its way to the small circle of political leaders as well as to the people. Germany

Dr. Imre de Jósika-Herczeg in the uniform of his last Regiment.
After a painting by Nicol Schattenstein, New York, 1931

Dr. Imre de Josika-Herczeg in the uniform of his last regiment. After a painting by Nicol Schattenstein, New York, 1931.

still clung to her imperialist and annexationist aims. While German military leaders were still convinced of ultimate victory, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy displayed an ever-increasing unwillingness to continue a war in which they had no selfish interest. The nations of the Monarchy wanted peace even at the price of small territorial sacrifices, but Germany was still pursuing the dream of complete victory. The rift between the two Central Powers was widened by the inclination of the German military leaders, not only to minimize the achievements of Austria-Hungary, but also to place upon her the responsibility for most of the military defeats and unsuccessful operations. This tendency was reflected in the attitude of the press. The German censor suppressed unfriendly statements regarding the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, but he could not and would not force the German newspapers to print sympathetic statements about a friendship that, in reality, hardly existed.

The diplomats and statesmen of pre-war Austria were unaccustomed to the use of the press as a weapon in political and diplomatic campaigns. Only in the third year of the war did they resort to propaganda in Germany in an effort to influence the German press through semi-official channels. This task as well as that of creating a more friendly attitude in Germany toward the Danubian Monarchy fell, in part, to me. I ventured to establish friendly relations between the writers and editors of the important German daily papers and the representatives of the Austro-Hungarian General Staff. I made clear the attitude of the Monarchy toward the members of the German press and tried to secure for them permissible news and other valuable information. They, in turn, reciprocated by presenting the military achievements of the Monarchy in a more fitting light. Many of the German journalists were men of unusual ability and admirable character and our relations developed into sincere friendships. Although it was seldom possible to obtain accurate information regarding the situation at the front, these men had a clearer vision than had the official leaders of Germany and were under no illusions whatsoever as to the inevitability of ultimate catastrophe. Although they held certain convictions with regard to the justice of the Dual Monarchy's political attitude, the members of the German General Staff still maintained bold and fantastic hopes of enlarging the German Empire.

In the higher German military circles the great discontent with the Supreme Command of the Austro-Hungarian forces and the "defeatist" attitude of the Viennese Ballplatz was expressed in a remark, "The best solution of this whole Austrian problem is simply to occupy the Monarchy!"

One of the circumstances that prevented better understanding was that the German public did not receive adequate information concerning the situation in Austria-Hungary. The Vienna Foreign Office therefore conceived the idea of inviting the editors and outstanding writers of the most important German publications to Vienna for the purpose of promoting good will. Arrangements were made for a visit of two weeks; the itinerary included the two capitals and points of special interest in the Hungarian provinces. I was entrusted with the task of selecting the prospective guests and of accompanying them to Vienna and Budapest.

Every political faction in Germany and every shade of political creed was represented; indeed so heterogeneous was the group that the impossibility of pleasing all was evident from the beginning. The same conditions which would make a favourable impression on the editor of an annexationist paper would meet opposition from the chief editorial Writer of a Left-wing daily; the information designed to appease the editor of a Bourgeois-Liberal newspaper would enrage the managing editor of a reactionary organ. The thirty-five members of the group represented thirty-five different opinions, and each, according to his own theory of foreign politics, hated the others. What has so often been described as “German unity” or the “united front of German public opinion” was here revealed in its tragic reality, a German unity composed of thirty-five centrifugal forces.

The Austrian government had placed at our disposal a luxuriously equipped special train, and when we arrived at Vienna representatives of the Foreign Office and the Supreme Command greeted us. The influential German guests were to be overwhelmed by the amiable Viennese hospitality. Every effort was to be made to create a good impression.

Our sojourn in Vienna was marked by an almost endless series of brilliant entertainments. On the first day a luncheon was given to our visitors by the City of Vienna at the City Hall. In the evening we went to the Vienna Opera House for a performance that was honoured by the presence of the late Emperor-King Charles. The following day the Emperor himself was our host at a buffet luncheon at the Gloriette in Schönbrunn, a summer palace of the Habsburgs on the outskirts of Vienna. The Chief of Staff, Baron von Arz, invited us for dinner to the Headquarters in Baden, a charming suburb of Vienna. All the dignitaries of Austria and the important members of the staff were present. On these occasions flowery speeches were delivered,

emphasizing the true spirit of friendship existing between the German Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and laying particular stress on the importance of a still closer alliance.

The speeches, the elaborate receptions and the genial Austrian hospitality seemed to make no impression on the German guests. They either knew too much of the "extra tours" of Austrian diplomacy that was constantly working for an immediate, and even a separate peace, or they felt that the entertainment was designed merely to create friendly feeling in Germany. They remained cold and unreceptive and strangely enough the thirty-five representatives of thirty-five political parties found a common platform in a staunch disbelief of Austrian sincerity.

The culminating point of the trip came when Count Burian, the Foreign Minister of the Monarchy, gave a reception in the magnificent halls of the Ballplatz, the home of the Austrian Foreign Office. It had been intimated that the Foreign Minister would issue a manifesto of the greatest importance on this occasion. Not only the guests of the Foreign Office, but also the important Vienna papers and the representatives of the foreign press had been informed that Count Burian would deliver an address which would have an important bearing on the political situation.

When we arrived in the reception rooms, the stage was set for the important event. Many members of the diplomatic corps, high dignitaries of the Church, members of the General Staff, statesmen and politicians were present. It seemed as if the old splendour of the famous "Haus am Ballplatz" would shine once again in the historic palace which saw the glorious days of Kaunitz and Metternich. The Foreign Minister himself, who was the "supreme clerk" of the Dual Monarchy rather than a spiritual descendant of the great Chancellors, seemed to be fully conscious of the importance of the event.

As Count Burian rose to deliver his historic address the chattering of the guests ceased. The Count spoke slowly, measuring his words and trying to express himself in the most diplomatic language possible. It was soon evident, however, that, although he was speaking to those present, his words were addressed to a distant audience, to the political leaders of the Entente. He touched briefly upon the determination of the Dual Monarchy to continue the war to the end, shoulder to shoulder with the German Empire. Suddenly he changed the tone of the address and voiced the opinion that the Monarchy

wanted peace, that it had no annexationist aims and that it refused to be identified with those who wished to continue war for imperialistic ends. The latter part of the speech, when the Count read from a sheet of paper, was ostensibly addressed to Germany. Those who could read between the lines—and my journalist friends could—inferred, first, that the Dual Monarchy was wholly dissatisfied with the general situation as well as with the annexationist policy followed by the German Empire; secondly, that the Dual Monarchy was willing to make peace at any price.

If Count Burian wished to express the Monarchy's eagerness for peace and at the same time to make a favourable appeal to German public opinion he failed utterly in both. He only convinced the Allies that Austria was on the verge of collapse and simultaneously destroyed the last remnants of co-operation between Germany and Austria. The effect of the address on the representatives of the German press was disastrous. I still recall the words of Dr. Becker, Managing Editor of the influential *Tagliche Rundschau*, who said to me when the speech ended, "Captain, apparently we have all been invited to a great funeral." It was the burial of German-Austrian friendship and the death-knell of the Habsburg Empire.

The impressions of following days in Hungary could not lighten the grim mood of the German journalists who had come to cement friendship and had found only what the Vienna Foreign Office wished to conceal, the ever-widening rift between the Central Powers. We were the guests of Alexander Wekerle, the last constitutional Premier of Hungary before the collapse; we were entertained by the Association of the Hungarian Press at Margaret Island on the Danube, where we enjoyed the forceful and poetic address of Eugene Rákosi; and we were the guests of honour at a performance in the Royal Opera House. But nothing could dispel the pessimism of the German delegation.

We visited the thousand-year-old seat of the Prince-Primate of Hungary. In a specially chartered yacht we sailed up the Danube, giving the German visitors ample opportunity to enjoy the romantic beauties of the valley. Arriving in Esztergom, we were driven to the palace in the Cardinal's famous four-in-hand coaches. The Cardinal himself, Dr. John Csernoch, awaited us on the steps of the white marble palace and raised his hands in blessing toward his distinguished guests.

During dinner the quaint historical atmosphere of the Prince Cardinal's Court carried us back to a time of long ago. Dinner was served on enormous dishes of pure gold. The lackeys, clad in the ancient national costume of the Hungarians, filled the Venetian glass tumblers with Tokay wine a hundred years old. On the walls hung paintings by the old masters of Italy, Germany and Hungary. And yet, in spite of all the magnificence and dignity of the surroundings, the atmosphere of friendliness filled the room, lending an informal and pleasant tone to the gathering. The Cardinal made a brilliant speech. Dr. Joseph Vészi, the editor-in-chief of the *Pester Lloyd*, spoke a few words concerning the Prince-Primate whom he called the only man in Hungary beloved by everyone, regardless of religious creed. Dr. Heinrich Rippler, one of the German editors, emphasized the necessity of a close friendship between Hungary and the German Empire, speaking of Hungary alone, as did all the representatives of the German press, as if wishing to show that German public opinion was able to discriminate between the two parts of the Dual Monarchy.

We spent one day in Tátra Lomnicz, a health resort in the Carpathian Mountains, and from there returned to Berlin. The storm of the new political crisis raged in the German capital, and the attention of the public was soon diverted from the Austro-German relations to the more important subject of a new course in German domestic politics.

7. THE COLLAPSE OF THE HABSBURG MONARCHY

THE REDL AFFAIR

The imminent question of the minorities in the Succession States is dwelt upon at length in the chapter on the Foreign Policy of Hungary but a short synopsis of that problem is here set forth. Before doing so, I should refresh my readers' memories with a brief resumé of the historical events which caused the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, in order to insure a better understanding of the great question that knocks at the door of Europe.

As far back as the time of Peter the Great the aim of Imperial Russia was to possess the Straits of Dardanelles. To effect this policy it was necessary, first, to bring under the hegemony of Russia all the small Slavic races, and the States surrounding Turkey in the Balkans; second, to drive Turkey from Europe; and third, to convince public opinion as well as the Chancellories of Europe that the fulfillment of Russia's aim was necessary for the "happiness of Europe." The World War, and especially the conditions after it, proved how wrong and dangerous this Russian policy was.

To carry out her aims, Imperial Russia expended enormous amounts of money to conduct propaganda against the welfare and safety of Germany and Austria-Hungary.

After the defeat of the Habsburgs in Spain, in the Netherlands and in Italy, they turned their eyes toward the Balkans, thus antagonizing Russia and boding no good for the rest of the world. Among diplomats the subsequent Russian policies in Eastern Europe have been known as the "Russian Shadow."

To accomplish the policy of Imperial Russia toward obtaining possession of the Dardanelles, the entrance gate to the Bosphorus and the strategic eastern gateway to the Mediterranean, Russia needed a part of Turkey as well as the surrounding small Slavic states in the Balkans (most of which were tributary vassal states of the Sultan, who was at that time friendly to the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy).

The Foreign Office at St. Petersburg held conference after conference. The friendly relations of the Balkan States and the Sultan with Vienna could not and would not be tolerated; such was the final decision of the Russian Court and the Foreign Office of the Tzar. This signalized the beginning of Russian propaganda—the greatest propaganda campaign in history, which finally plunged Europe into the World War.

However, in its Balkan policies Russia was sadly humiliated. The first great reverse came through Great Britain, working with the other European Powers, following the efforts of Bismarck and Andrássy, who in 1878 ascertained for themselves what Russia was attempting in Europe. The "Zweibund," a close federation between Germany and Austria-Hungary, was formed for self-protection and for safeguarding the balance of power in Europe. This federation, when joined by Italy (1883), became known as the "Triple Alliance." The Alliance was directed against Imperial Russia. Today, in what seems to be historic coincidence, this situation is re-created, with the difference that Soviet Russia is not a danger zone of and for Europe merely, but a danger zone for the entire world; and that instead of a Triple Alliance, all the great Powers are combining against Soviet Russia.

The diplomacy of Bismarck and Andrássy was looked upon favourably by Great Britain because she did not want to see a super-Slavic power in the Near East. A Slavic hegemony would unbalance Europe.

At the Congress in Berlin (1878), through the efforts of Andrássy and Bismarck, seconded by Great Britain, Germany and Italy, Austria-Hungary was empowered to occupy the two Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which had been promised to Serbia by "her big Russian brother." The sequel to this reverse to Russia came in 1908 when Austria and Hungary finally annexed the two provinces.

The small Slavic states, "our Russian brothers" as they were called by the Russian propagandists, were disturbed by these failures. But as the Russian rubles continued in even greater quantities, the Slavic political leaders did not show much concern over this turn in history.

But the Tzar's government was troubled. The intellectuals and the Left-wing Socialists and Radicals who were then preparing for the greatest of all revolutions, smiled at the Russian humiliation. This was a portent of history

to them! Many had been deported to Siberia; many more had fled to foreign countries. Tzar Alexander was killed by a bomb.

Something had to be done with public opinion; it had to be converted by "inside propaganda" to favour the government's foreign policy. Internal conditions in Russia were exposed in 1905 by the mutiny of the sailors on the cruiser "Prince Potemkin." The corruption of the officers and the cruel mistreatment of the crew provoked the latter to kill all their officers and throw their bodies overboard. The Odessa Fleet was directed to capture the rebellious cruiser, but when ordered to fire on the "Prince Potemkin" the crews refused and the mutineers passed serenely by the Tzar's "punitive fleet." Later the cruiser was disarmed in Rumanian waters by the Rumanian Navy. The weak Tzar Nicholas promised the sailors amnesty on their return, but on their arrival they were made prisoners. The leaders subsequently were shot and the rest exiled to Siberia. Thousands of Russians openly sympathized with the mutineers, only to be shot for their courage by the dreaded Cossacks. From such a picture the Russian government sought to distract the people by display of diplomacy abroad.

For her humiliations, a bitter revenge was being prepared in St. Petersburg. Izvolsky had become Secretary of State for Imperial Russia. Opposed to him was the Foreign Minister for the Dual Monarchy in Vienna, Count Aehrentahl, an able statesman, who formerly had been Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in the Russian capital and understood Russian policies.

A new check to Russian ambition came when the Vienna Foreign Office was able to place on the Serbian throne Milan Obrenovitch, a devoted friend of Austria and Hungary and of Francis Joseph. Similarly Andrássy placed Prince Alexander of Battenberg on the throne of Bulgaria. Alexander was acceptable to the Powers, even to Russia, who reluctantly acceded to his selection. But the agents of the St. Petersburg Chancellors were already at work. Hired assassins came by night to the royal palace in Sofia, the Bulgarian capital. Prince Alexander fled under cover of a stormy night, thereby saving his life.

The Viennese diplomats thereupon invited Bulgarian statesmen to Vienna to select another prince friendly to Austria for the Bulgar throne. The Bulgarian delegation, headed by Premier Stambuloff (later murdered by Russian assassins), was entertained royally. One night at the Imperial Opera House, a young and distinguished officer of the First Hungarian Hussars was pointed

out to Stambuloff. The youthful Lieutenant was Prince Ferdinand of Coburg, who was sitting in a box with his extraordinary mother, the Princess Clementine of Coburg. As Ferdinand was one of the richest Princes of royal blood in Europe, a close relation of the Royal House of Great Britain, and at the same time a man of fine character and abilities as a statesman, the affair was quickly concluded.

Ferdinand became one of the greatest kings, not only of Bulgaria but of Europe, at that time. He made Sofia one of the most beautiful cities in the Near East, and encouraged greatly the culture and material development of his country. But Russia wanted other things—not the development of the people, not schools—nothing but the Dardanelles.

Again Russia was defeated. Not only Austria but also Germany and Britain protected Ferdinand. Russia could do nothing but wait for revenge.

Izvolsky turned his eyes toward Serbia. There Russia was able to buy politicians and to force King Milan to abdicate. The Chancellories of Vienna, Berlin, London and Rome acted at once. King Milan was allowed to remain Commander-in-Chief of the Serbian army; while his son Alexander, who had not the shrewd brilliance of his amiable father, succeeded to the throne. That was not what St. Petersburg wanted. The Obrenovitch dynasty proved itself loyal to the Habsburgs, and refused to dance to Russian music. Therefore, one night King Alexander and his wife were murdered in their sleep in the Royal Palace. That was Russia's terrible revenge on the Vienna Foreign Office.

St. Petersburg was firmly decided to carry out Russian policies despite Europe and despite any consequences. It Was decided to show Austria and Germany that they could not have the hegemony of the Balkans. The Tzar's advisers, amid great festivities, placed the penniless Peter Karageorgevitch on the Serbian throne. Knowing the Russian plans, he was selected to carry them out, supported by Russian money.

The beginnings of the World War lead back to Sedan in 1871, when Napoleon III. was crushed by the Prussian and United German armies. The Germans marched into the heart of France and, prepared by Bismarck, the Deutsche Reich was founded at a meeting of all the German rulers in the Royal Palace at Versailles. The German military party humiliated France, not because she asked 5,000,000,000 francs as war indemnity, but because against

the statesmanlike ideas of Bismarck, the military leaders annexed Alsace-Lorraine, meriting, in French minds, revenge against Germany. It is true that Lorraine and even a part of Alsace had been German provinces; but had the German military party followed Bismarck's advice, the World War might never have taken place.

Germany after 1871 developed gigantically. Bismarck, the creator of new Germany, pointed the way to these achievements. German industry, German work, German tenacity and honesty and reliability of character were to be great national assets in making Germany one of the foremost countries of the world. Here one comes to the psychological point of Great Britain's part in the World War.

Britain's captains of industry and high finance, especially, were jealous of Germany's swift and powerful progress in commerce and industry. Not only in Europe but in the Far East, if one travelled in pre-war times, one could see the trademark "Made in Germany" on much of the merchandise that one bought. (The author has seen those three words on goods sold even in England.) German thrift and the rapid development of the enormous German war machine determined Great Britain to conclude the entente with France and Russia. Thus she weighted down the scales of war.

The new Russian Foreign Minister, Izvolsky, who came into power in 1906, saw two reasons for war: one, revenge on Austria-Hungary, entailing expansion in the Balkans and probably the possible seizure of the Dardanelles; the other, the fear of an internal revolution, which was to occur in far bigger dimensions than Izvolsky ever imagined. He wanted to see the armies and navies mobilized, to set them to work upon his new expansionist policies—this time in the Far East against Japan. It is known how the Japanese fleet, commanded by Admiral Togo, sank almost the entire Russian fleet at Port Arthur in 1904, and later in 1905 at the Straits of Tshoushima: hostilities were ended by the Peace Treaty at Portsmouth, in the United States, on September 5, 1905. Russia and Japan became friends again and Russia abandoned her Far Eastern policies of expansion, turning her eyes once more toward the Balkans.

In 1908 Izvolsky arranged a meeting between the Tzar and the British King, Edward VII., at Reval. At that meeting Izvolsky's bid for the Dardanelles fell on deaf ears. After Reval, he made a tour of the European Chancellories. He

appeared first at Vienna, where Count Lexa-Aehrenthal, the Foreign Minister, received him amiably. He knew Izvolsky. Izvolsky suggested to Aehrenthal that, if Russia could pass through the Dardanelles with her battleships and commercial fleet, she would "permit" Austria-Hungary on the other hand to annex finally the already occupied provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Aehrenthal, one of the cleverest and shrewdest diplomats of Europe, accepted the proposition and acting immediately—before Izvolsky could reach Rome, Paris and London—promulgated the plan for the annexation of the two provinces. Aehrenthal knew that London would never consent to the passage of Russian warships through the Dardanelles; therefore he generously consented to it. When Izvolsky finally came to London, the British Secretary of Foreign Affairs made him clearly understand that Great Britain would never consent to his proposition. Meantime, Austria-Hungary having annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina, Izvolsky came to realize that he had been duped by Aehrenthal and, in his bitterness, swore revenge against Austria and Hungary.

At this point, when Izvolsky resigned as Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs and was appointed as Ambassador to France, the real preparation of Russia's part for the World War was begun.

Britain, and Edward VII., wanted to save Austria and Hungary. The author knows of the efforts of the late British King to persuade Francis Joseph I. to abandon the German Alliance, or at least remain neutral, but the aged Emperor-King, although sensing disaster to his country and dynasty, remained loyal to his pledge to Germany. After this, Serbia, aided by Russian money and influence, had Francis Ferdinand, heir to the thrones of Austria and Hungary, assassinated.

The famous visit to St. Petersburg of the heir to the thrones of Austria and Hungary before the World War was the cause of great diplomatic excitement in Europe. Brilliant fetes and lavish receptions marked the presence of the Archduke at the court of the last Romanoff. Francis Ferdinand was a great friend of the Tzar. At least, the Archduke believed so.

In view of the Franco-Russian alliance, the visit of Francis Ferdinand was diplomatic perversity for the reason that it was well known in diplomatic circles that Russia considered the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and of the house of Habsburg imminent and necessary, as the first step toward the

realization of Russia's imperialistic and militaristic aims. On the other hand, the visit of Francis Ferdinand proved that the Central Powers had not yet given up the hope of loosening the ties between France, Russia and Britain, known as "The Entente Cordiale." This visit was intended to "neutralize" Russia in the case of a new Balkan conflict and the establishment of the Danubian Monarchy.

The author believes firmly that the diplomatic representatives of Austria and Hungary in St. Petersburg, as well as the Foreign Office in Vienna, knew the situation thoroughly. But, as an attempt to prevent war, the friendly personal relationship of Francis Ferdinand with the Tzar was used in a last diplomatic effort.

The Archduke departed from St. Petersburg with the firm belief that his visit had distinctly eased Austro-Russian relations.

In this connection it is worth recounting, as psychological background, how the Court, the Foreign Office and the General Staff of Imperial Russia functioned. When Francis Ferdinand boarded his special train in St. Petersburg, and after the Tzar had twice kissed him good-bye, with a regiment of guards at salute and a band playing the Habsburg anthem, the Military Attaché of the Austro-Hungarian Embassy at St. Petersburg was invited to join the royal party. The Military Attaché was to accompany the Crown Prince as far as Warsaw. Francis Ferdinand, who regarded himself as an authority in military as well as in political affairs of the Monarchy, told the Attaché that the Tzar displayed a very friendly attitude toward the Monarchy, and that he thought Russia could still be won over to the side of the Triple Alliance (Austria-Hungary, Germany and Italy).

"The most important thing for the time being," said the naïf Archduke to the Military Attaché, "is to evade every possible friction with Russia. No antagonizing of the Russian Empire. No espionage in the future. It is unnecessary to maintain a net of espionage in Russia." His Imperial Highness also said that he did not want to hear about "intelligence service" in Russia.

The Attaché listened with deep reverence to the words of his Imperial master. Yes, he understood. No espionage in Russia. No antagonizing. Of course, if the Tzar "assured" his Imperial Highness of Russia's good will, naturally this gave a new aspect to the situation. The Attaché stood in rigid attention before

the heir to the throne; with a light nod of his head, the Crown Prince signified that the audience was at an end. The Attaché withdrew and, when the Imperial train reached Warsaw, he alighted and prepared to return to St. Petersburg.

He had to spend a day and a night in Warsaw. He had friends there, all kinds of friends—Polish aristocrats, Russian officers, and men of nondescript professions, who used to visit him at intervals, and to bring certain news to him. He saw a few of these acquaintances during his short stay. Among others he had a secret meeting with a colonel of the Russian army, a member of the General Staff, who had sometimes given certain information to him. He was always paid well for "interesting" news. The news he now offered was, in fact, of eminent interest. It was a detailed plan of Russian mobilization in case of war. War against whom? Against Austria and Hungary and Germany, of course. Well—His Imperial Highness forbade an intelligence service; His Imperial Highness was thoroughly convinced of Russia's good will. But this mobilization plan put the good will of Russia and of the Tzar in an entirely new light. The Attaché bought the plan and a bargain was made.

Two days later the Attaché arrived in St. Petersburg. He found an icy reception in the official Russian circles in which he was wont to move, and twenty-four hours later he was recalled to Vienna. The Attaché was perplexed. On the train he bought a newspaper. It featured a terrible sensation. A staff colonel had committed suicide. Reasons unknown. The staff colonel was the man who had sold him the mobilization plan of the Russian army in Warsaw. The shrewd Attaché began to understand. He must have been denounced by some member of the Russian espionage system. Someone must have discovered the affair. But there were only a few men who could possibly know about his "deal," and those men were all on the Austrian General Staff, so the traitor must be there—in Vienna or somewhere in Austria.

The Attaché was not received by Francis Ferdinand after his return; however, he had a prolonged conference with the leaders of the Austro-Hungarian intelligence service. The shrewdest members of the service, the best detectives the country could mobilize, were called in and soon the net was spread in which the traitor was to be caught. The intelligence service of the Austro-Hungarian General Staff never before had faced a more difficult and intricate problem than that which ended with the exposure of the most sensational espionage affair in many years. They knew only that the traitor

must be sought in the highest Austrian military circles, within the General Staff. But how to expose him? How to get sufficient and substantial evidence against this mysterious Staff Officer? The supposition upon which the investigation set out was that if a member of the General Staff, a high officer, could be brought or persuaded to join the Russian espionage system, he would do it only for a large amount of money. Consequently, he must live on a high scale and spend far more than his military pay or private income.

This meagre lead, which represented nothing but a hypothesis, was followed for months. The political condition of Austria, undermined at that time by the secret political propaganda of Russia, made the investigation more difficult. At last the attention of the investigators was forced on Colonel Redl, Chief of Staff of the Army Corps at Prague, now the capital of Czecho-Slovakia.

Redl lived on a high scale, maintained a mansion and a country estate, had several automobiles. The source of his income was unknown to anyone. It seemed impossible to suspect Colonel Redl of the crime. He was an extremely gifted Staff Officer, and his record was excellent. He stood at the beginning of a brilliant career and was already singled out for the highest position that a great army could offer. Nothing indicated his connection with the Russian espionage service. On the contrary, he did some valuable intelligence service work himself.

For months Colonel Redl was shadowed by the Austrian Secret Service. First there was only indirect evidence against him. Later something more important was discovered—he was receiving money from Russia in very large amounts. The net began to close around Colonel Redl. At regular intervals the rubles came from St. Petersburg or from Russian sources in Paris. Colonel Redl was seen meeting suspicious-looking men and handing over to one of them a piece of paper. The men were arrested. They were Russian spies, evidently, but the contents of the secret missive could not be deciphered; it was written in code. What code? The paper was rushed to Vienna—to the code department of the Foreign Office. Several days elapsed before the letter could be deciphered. It began with these words: “The Skoda ammunition factory has received orders for a new type of gun . . . etc.”

Within the hour Colonel Redl was arrested and brought to Vienna. And there one of the strangest things happened. The traitor was not put in jail, but was

taken by two officers into a hotel. There, in a room, the officers handed him a loaded revolver and told him that they would leave him alone for five minutes. Three minutes after they had left, a shot was fired in the room. Redl was dead. The next day the newspapers of Austria-Hungary, Germany and later all of Europe, published the news of Colonel Redl's suicide.It was one of the gravest mistakes (among the many the Austrian General Staff made) not to bring Redl to a public trial: for if this had been done the map of Europe would be different today, and perhaps the World War would never have occurred. The Austrian General Staff (the author speaks always of the "Austrian Staff," although it was the Austro-Hungarian General Staff, because Hungary was never permitted to say anything and generally was notified of happenings oniy after the events) kept everything secret. Francis Ferdinand himself was informed about the Red! affair only at its conclusion. Naturally a few details leaked out; but only after the War did the world learn the details of the case. We know today that Colonel Redl was the head of the Russian espionage system in Austria-Hungary, and the Chief of Staff of the Army Corps in Prague was the centre of the pre-war Russian propaganda against Austria-Hungary. He, as the Chief of Staff of the most important Army Corps, was naturally notified of all important military and political happenings in the Habsburg Monarchy. He delivered all important military and political news and plans of the Monarchy to Russia, and, at the same time, he denounced the members of the Austrian intelligence service to the Russian General Staff. This was the reason why the Central Powers were completely misinformed about the mobilization plan of the Russian army, and why they did not know anything about the existence of the seventy-five extra Russian divisions, with the help of which Russia was able to crush the Austro-Hungarian army in the first part of the War.

All of this, of course, would have turned out differently if the Austrian General Staff had brought Redl to an open trial. The existence of the immense Russian espionage system (which in Soviet Russia today is far greater than it was in Imperial Russia before the War) could have been exposed before the whole world and it would have been evident which of the European Powers were working constantly to bring about the general conflagration of Europe. The RedI case was, naturally, only one link in the chain of Russian espionage. How this system worked, what the secret underground channels of information were, how Imperial Russia undermined the whole of Europe with its extensive espionage system, is still a secret. Soviet Russia, which has already published the important correspondence between Izvolsky and Sazonov, the chief

originators of the World War, would certainly be in a position to throw light upon the work of the Russian espionage system, and would, thereby, contribute much to the final solution of the war-guilt problem. There is no doubt today, however, that Serbia hired the assassins for the murder of Francis Ferdinand, and there is no doubt that in St. Petersburg the "great friend" of the unfortunate Crown Prince gave the orders for it.

Archduke Francis Ferdinand was condemned to die because he was too dangerous to Russian aims.

In connection with the assassination of Francis Ferdinand, Bohemia received her instructions from St. Petersburg, as did the Slovak leaders. Only Germany, Bulgaria and the Turks remained loyal to Austria and Hungary.

After Russia had received the loan from France, Izvolsky resigned as Secretary of State to take the Ambassadorship to France, in order to put the finishing touches to the preparations for the World War, in the French capital, which was nearer to the stage of events.

The actors were assigned their roles from St. Petersburg and Paris. And before the curtain went up, the prelude to the World War started—the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary, and his wife, were assassinated by Serbian agents hired by the Serbian General Staff upon the orders of Russia, with the knowledge of the Government of Serbia.

Such were the diplomatic preparations for the World War.

8. SOME PRELIMINARIES TO THE WORLD WAR

COUNT TISZA'S EFFORTS FOR PEACE

For the last ten years historians and statesmen have been occupied with the question of "War Responsibility." Almost immediately after the War, the German Socialist government, the Austrian and Hungarian governments, later the Russian Soviets, published complete and analytical compilations of their countries' secret pre-war diplomatic correspondence. In 1926 Great Britain published her report regarding her own share in that conflict, but so far France has made no attempt to set forth her participation in the catastrophe of Europe. (There is a rumor [in 1934], however, that she is now planning to do so.)

This wealth of testimony added new source material to the existing mass of memoirs and self-justifying literature recently published by some of the statesmen who were prominent in European affairs before 1914, and has made systematic research possible on this very important question.

Indeed, those who have approached the problem in a cool and unprejudiced spirit and in a scientific frame of mind have gradually become convinced that the "responsibility" is collective and cannot be placed on any one country or group of allied countries.

All the nations of Europe, in varying degrees, to be sure— whether through ambitions for territorial expansion, through fear carried to the extent of aggressiveness, or through mistaken interpretation of a neighbour's policy—all the nations of Europe must share the great responsibility for the War. The sooner this fact is admitted by political leaders and recognized by the world's public opinion, the sooner substantial progress toward guaranteeing peace will be achieved.

However, my intention in writing this book is not to enter into a discussion of War responsibility, and, although a survey of those aspects of European diplomacy which affected the late Austro-Hungarian monarchy forces me to consider Russian policy prior to the War, I shall endeavour to be fair and unbiased.

From time immemorial, Russia had had her eye on the Dardanelles, which she considered, rightly or wrongly, as her logical southern outlet to the sea. But between her and her goal stood not only the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the Balkan states friendly to the latter, but also the great weight of European political opinion, which would have looked askance at any such disturbance of the delicately adjusted balance of power.

At the outbreak of the war, Izvolsky, then Russian Ambassador to France, exclaimed: "This is my war." The attack on Europe was prepared in 1911. Evidence of this has been gathered by historians from correspondence among the Russian principals in the transactions.

The publication of the Russian secret documents brought many surprises to those who had accepted the Preamble to the Treaty of Versailles of 1919 at its face value. Not least among these was the apparent implication of France in Russia's avowedly aggressive policies.

France has so far not made her secret diplomatic correspondence public. Some French, as well as foreign, writers have gone so far as to declare that France planned the War in order to recover Alsace-Lorraine, taken from her by the German military party against Bismarck's advice after the War of 1870. However, it seems to me that this view is exaggerated and dangerously misleading. Undoubtedly there did exist in France after 1870 a feeling of great bitterness toward and fear of Germany, which often distorted public opinion, and which even occasionally beclouded the judgment of French statesmen. The "revanche" had already been practically planted in the schools of France. The "revanche" was one part of the public spirit of France. It was the result of a bad peace treaty. Alas, other bad peace treaties have been drawn up since then! It was this feeling which drew France into the friendship with Russia, whom she saw as a powerful ally in the event of war. France entered this alliance with the enthusiasm of someone relieved from a dreaded danger, but it does not seem possible that her statesmen could have fully realized how perilous to the peace of Europe were the dreams in which the Russian Foreign Office indulged.

Even as late as 1913 the Russians themselves apparently saw that French public opinion did not fully endorse the Franco-Russian alliance. There exists on this subject an interesting correspondence between Izvolsky, Russian Ambassador to France, and Sazanov, Russian Foreign Minister. These

telegrams, incidentally, throw full and significant light on the volatile and unsteady temperament of Izvolsky and show not only how he received certain impressions of French views and policies, but also how his exaggerated messages were calculated to inflame the Tzar's government with undue and catastrophic hopes.

But even though the Russian Secret Documents undoubtedly exaggerated the role played by France in Russian policy, even though Izvolsky's reports to the home government imputed ideas to Poincaré which the French Premier doubtless never entertained, let alone expressed, it is nevertheless understandable that the Franco-Russian Alliance should have assumed terrifying proportions in European imaginations and should have been looked upon with fear and misgiving by the Central Powers. A gleam of hope, however, was seen in the strong personal friendship supposed to be felt by the Tzar for the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne: Francis Ferdinand, later assassinated.

COUNT TISZA AND THE WORLD WAR

As early as August, 1913, the roles of each of the fighting parties in the World War had been assigned by Russia. Far from being fortuitous, the assassination of Francis Ferdinand, heir to the thrones of Austria and Hungary, and his wife, at Sarajevo, was carefully planned by the Russian and Serbian governments. The people of the Dual Monarchy were alarmed. Count Stephen Tisza, Premier of Hungary, instantly called a Cabinet meeting, to prevent the declaration of war against Serbia, and immediately after leaving for Vienna he advised the aged Emperor-King Francis Joseph against such a war. But he was powerless against Count Berchtold, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Austria-Hungary, and Conrad, Chief of Staff. Tisza, the outstanding statesman, repeated his opposition against a punitive war with Serbia three times, and submitted memoranda to Francis Joseph expressing his fears for the future of the Dual Monarchy.

During the tragic days that followed the Sarajevo murder, the fate of all Europe was at stake. Was there to be war, or was this incident to be glossed over like so many others? The conflicting interests of the two groupings of European Powers had been thrown into sharp relief, but the real decision lay with Russia and Austria.

Russia, arrogant in the strength of a recently completed military program, was disposed to recklessness; Austria was torn between the extreme aggressiveness of the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister, Count Berchtold, and the wise far-sightedness of Francis Joseph, and the Hungarian Prime Minister, Count Tisza, both of whom sought to restrain Berchtold. Had their influence prevailed, European pressure might have been brought to bear on Russia, and war might thus have been prevented.

It is necessary to say a few words about the individual policy, the greatest ambition, of the assassinated heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary, to make it easier to understand, for the reader, why this political murder had been arranged. The policy of the assassinated heir to the throne had been to strengthen the late Habsburg Monarchy by the creation of a third, independent part of the Dual Monarchy. This third part was supposed to be composed of the South Slavic states of Austria-Hungary, which today make up Yugo-Slavia. The nucleus of this new part of the Monarchy had been Croatia, where the murdered heir was supposed to have enough adherents for success—which, of course, was not true. Francis Ferdinand was one of the most unpopular men in the Empire, especially among the Hungarians, whom he disliked.

For this ambition of his, he had to die, for the reason that Russia wanted it differently. . . . Russia wanted all the small Balkan states to support Russia, and not Austria-Hungary, with the old aim of seizing the Dardanelles, which aim Prince Gorchakoff had not been able to realize at the Congress of Berlin in 1878. Izvolsky tried to realize this Russian dream in 1914. What did he care for what might follow? On the new map of Europe the reader sees that the nucleus of the newly created Yugo-Slavia is not Croatia, as Francis Ferdinand wished, but Serbia, according to the old Russian policy. This was put through by the Allied Powers after the World War, which swept away the thrones not only of the Habsburgs, but also of the Romanoffs and the Hohenzollerns.

Francis Joseph's pacifist ideas and his intimate knowledge of the European situation reinforced a natural reluctance to end his reign in war. He had grown cautious with the repeated failures of his military undertakings, but old age had lowered his powers of resistance. Although unmoved by the assassination of the nephew, whom he thoroughly disliked, he was depressed over the situation to which the murder of his heir gave rise. Francis Joseph's efforts toward moderation were evident in his proclamation addressed to the peoples

of the Dual Monarchy after the murder, particularly in that passage in which he refused to identify the Serbian officials with a small group of assassins. He even went so far, in his will to prevent war, as to order the instant and unconditional release of the Serbian Chief of Staff and his daughter, who were caught in the train toward Belgrade, in Budapest.

But unfortunately, according to Austrian custom, foreign policy for the Dual Monarchy was governed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Count Berchtold, who held this office at this crucial time, was influenced by the warlike attitude of the German military party, although as Ambassador to St. Petersburg he had previously had full opportunity to understand Russia's ambitions in the Balkans and to recognize the dangers of a conflict with her. Supported by his chief advisers in the Foreign Office, Count Hoyos and Count Forgács, he issued the declaration of war, which had been worded by Baron Musulin, also of the Foreign Office.

Tisza, who had struggled desperately to prevent war at this time, wrote to one of his relatives: "Even a victorious war is dreadful, because, according to my soul, every war means misery, the unhappiness of women and children. I am embittered about this war, especially since I am compelled to take part in it, and even the sympathetic ovations of my friends give me the greatest pain. I am miserable, that I cannot be at the actual front. I can state with calm and clear conscience that I already feel the rope around our neck, which will choke us to death at any opportune moment, if we are unable to cut it."[1]

On July 1, 1914, Tisza wrote to Francis Joseph I.: "I could not hide my great worries from Count Berchtold, concerning his intentions to be radically aggressive toward Serbia because of the dreadful assassination at Sarajevo. I cannot share the responsibility in this matter with Count Berchtold. Our position, our foreign policy, may gravitate to the worst and we shall appear to the entire world to have ruined the peace of Europe, which would mean starting the war under the most impossible and unfavourable circumstances. Even the time which he selected is most unfortunate, for the reason that

1 In the 1930's the Hungarian Academy of Sciences published a collection of Count Tisza's letters, analyzed by the famous historian Oscar von Wertheimer.

Rumania is lost to our cause without the slightest possibility of our finding another ally to co-operate with us. Bulgaria is the only neighbour which is a friend, but Bulgaria is weakened, exhausted, and on the verge of a complete breakdown. Although I think it is too late, we must try to straighten out matters with Rumania and Bulgaria and invite both to become our allies. We must also try to restrain the German Emperor in his antagonistic dealings with Serbia. This is urgent, since William II. is expected in Vienna at the funeral of the assassinated heir to the throne." (The Emperor of Germany, however, did not come to the funeral of Francis Ferdinand, as the Viennese police were unable to guarantee his adequate protection.)

After the declaration of war, says the historian Wertheimer, Tisza's influence grew tremendously in the Dual Monarchy, but unfortunately the influence of this great pacifist came too late. Marshal Conrad, the Chief of Staff, and Count Berchtold (who regarded Tisza as the leader of a dependent country) made the Hungarian Premier lasting trouble by not informing him of their plans. Complaining about this, Tisza wrote to Berchtold: "Your attitude in the past was loyal to me, making it possible for me to see our problems clearly. I will not permit anyone to keep me in the dark about our affairs—for instance, as in the case of the attempt of the United States of America to act as an intermediary—because I am also responsible for the entire foreign policy of the Monarchy and I shall work with the Minister of Foreign Affairs only if I am absolutely certain that nothing is being hidden from me."

Count Tisza resigned as Premier of Hungary at the age of fifty and went to the front as a Lieutenant-Colonel of the Royal Hussars, selecting for his active service the so-called Brussilov front, the dangerous entrenchment opposite the Russian lines in the North. His regiment adored Tisza, whose courage was exceeded only by his great love for the Hungarian soldiers. He often went out to the farthest outposts in his desire to share the hardships and danger with his men. His life was spared on the battlefield, only to be later taken by assassins in his own home.

On November 6, 1918, during the communistic riots under Béla Kun, Count Tisza was attacked by a mob at his home in Budapest, to which he had retired after his premiership and active war service. The police force, detailed by the last constitutional government of Hungary to safeguard Tisza and his family, laid down their arms without protest and allowed the assassins to advance unhindered. When they penetrated to the interior of the house, battering

down the heavy oak doors as they went, they found Count Tisza standing in the centre of his study with a revolver in his hand. The Countess Tisza, his wife, stood trembling at his side. On the other side was a cousin of Count Tisza, Countess Denise Almássy. Both ladies pleaded for the life of Tisza and attempted to shield him with their own bodies, but the assassins fired and Tisza fell mortally wounded. His last words were: “This was bound to come.” Two days later his only son, Count Stephen Tisza, Jr., died in a sanitarium.

9. THE ARMISTICE AND THE "FOURTEEN POINTS"

On January 8, 1918, Woodrow Wilson delivered an address at a joint session of the two Houses of the United States Congress outlining the fourteen points which he considered the necessary basis for a general peace.[1] The following October 7, negotiations with the Central Powers began with the German note to President Wilson accepting the terms laid down in the fourteen points. In his reply on October 8, Wilson asked the German government if he was to understand definitely that the terms laid down in his address of January 8 and subsequent addresses were accepted and that nothing remained except discussion of the practical details of their applications. The German government returned an unconditional affirmative to this question on October 12.

On October 14, there were further communications from the President of the United States concerning submarine warfare and guarantees of the representative character of the German government. On October 20, Germany promised to observe the rules of civilized warfare on land and sea and gave assurance that her ministers spoke for the majority of the German people.

President Wilson announced on October 23 that, "having received the solemn and explicit assurance of the German government that it unreservedly accepts the terms of peace laid down in his address of the eighth of January, 1918, and the principles of settlement announced in subsequent addresses, particularly in the address of the twenty-seventh of September, 1918," he had communicated the correspondence to the Allied Powers with the suggestion that they ask their military advisers to draw up armistice terms. On November 5 he transmitted to the German government the reply of the Allied governments declaring their'willingness to make peace in accordance with his fourteen points and the principles of settlement laid down in subsequent addresses but with qualifications regarding the freedom of the seas and

1 President Wilson's Fourteen Points are reported at the end of this chapter.

reparations. The Armistice, based on Wilson's proposals, was signed on November 11 and fighting on the battlefields came to an end.

The Armistice with Hungary was concluded in Belgrade by Count Károlyi with the French General Franchet d'Esperay. Before this settlement General Diaz of Italy dispatched his representative, Major Francisco Carbone, a member of the Italian General Staff, to Hungary. Carbone, selected for this mission because of his ability and command of the Hungarian language, informed Károlyi and his government that Italy was willing to occupy Hungary with her army until the question of definite Hungarian frontiers was settled at the Peace Conference, provided that the occupation would be amicably received by Károlyi and his advisers. With the exception of Fiume, Italy had no ambition to gain Hungarian territory and asked only financial compensation for the friendly occupation. Had Károlyi accepted the offer, it is possible that vast territories would not have been lost, the situation of the nation would have been improved, and Hungary could have entered the peace conference "*intra dominium*.." Károlyi did not have the vision to accept this proposal and, wishing to show the Entente that Hungary 'was no longer associated with Austria, he concluded the Armistice with France to the great disadvantage of his country. In offering Hungary separate Armistice terms, France and Italy after the war became rivals for dominance in Eastern Europe.

With the announcement that "he did not want to see any more soldiers," Károlyi, the unintelligent dictator, had recalled the Hungarian troops from the front. They were then stationed on the demarcation line outlined by Diaz, a division which closely paralleled the old frontiers of Hungary. Shortly after Károlyi's order, masses of disordered and undisciplined soldiers rushed homeward, leaving behind them millions of dollars' worth of war equipment, ammunition and food reserves. Little was left of the sturdy and well-trained army, and Hungary was almost completely disarmed even before the Peace Conference.

To effect a successful peace, any desire for revenge must cease when the treaty is signed since the innocent peoples of defeated countries cannot be blamed for the blunders of their governments. Lincoln embraced the defeated South after the Civil War and concluded a treaty of love and not of hatred. In setting forth the fourteen points, Wilson attempted to found world peace on the basis of international justice and understanding, but when the treaty was finally concluded the majority of the fourteen points had been disregarded.

Wilson's first principle demanding open diplomacy and public treaties was outmaneuvered. The Entente confirmed the secret treaties of August, 1916, between Great Britain, France, Italy, Russia and Rumania, which ceded Transylvania and other Hungarian territories, with a total of 5 million inhabitants, to the last-named country. The Serbs and Czechs had previously received allotted to them by secret treaties concluded in Corfu, Cleveland and Pittsburgh.[2] It is surprising and ironic that Wilson's principle of open diplomacy was violated by treaties drawn up in his own country.

Points two and three, regarding free trade and the removal of economic barriers, were almost entirely ignored.

The Wilson disarmament principle, point four, laid down to guarantee future peace, was applied by the Entente only to the vanquished German, Austrian, Hungarian and Bulgarian nations. On November 1, 1918, the Czecho-Slovakian army had 70,000 soldiers, the Yugo-Slav, 60,000, and the Rumanian, 127,000. Today, fifteen years after the war, these national armies are almost as large as two-thirds of the entire population of Hungary. The Treaty of Trianon only permitted Hungary an army of thirty-five thousand troops, or one and one-half army corps, a ratio of 1:17 to that of her three neighbors. In 1922, Hungary had 525 machine guns, while Czecho-Slovakia had 3,200; Yugo-Slavia, 560, and Rumania, 4,870. The same proportion existed in the apportionment of artillery, for against Hungary's 105 cannon, Czecho-Slovakia, Yugo-Slavia and Rumania had respectively 800; 722; and 1,822 cannon. The peace treaty did not allow Hungary any military airplanes, but Czecho-Slovakia now possesses 1,400, Yugo-Slavia, 70 and Rumania, 80. Hungary is not permitted to mobilize, although according to the plans of 1920 Czecho-Slovakia can raise an army of from two to three millions, Yugo-Slavia one of 1,600,000 and Rumania a force of 2,500,000. This number, 6,400,000 men, is more than two-thirds of the entire population of Hungary. And of even more concern is the fact that the Succession States of the Little Entente are allowed compulsory military service, while the former Central Powers must depend on volunteers for their armies.

2 The Pittsburgh Treaty.

The impartial adjustment of colonial claims, point five, has never been recognized. All the German colonies and the Austro-Hungarian settlement in China have been seized and appropriated without compensation.

In settlement of the ninth point, relating to the readjustment of the Italian frontier, Italy received Fiume and neighbouring territory. Hungary lost her only seaport in which many hundreds of millions of good crowns had been invested for development. Fiume was a centre of utmost importance to Hungarian industry and commerce.

Wilson's tenth point promised just autonomy to the peoples of Hungary. In an address on February 11, 1918, he said, "Self-determination is not a mere phrase. It is an imperative principle of action which statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril. . . . Every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made at the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned and not as a part of any mere adjustment or compromise claims of rival states." Had this principle been carried out, Hungary could not have been mutilated. Instead of autonomy, however, millions of people were taken from their country against their will, leaving in Hungary only eight of her previous twenty-one millions of people. The only plebiscite was held in Western Hungary, where the vote was almost two to one in favour of retaining Hungarian rule and citizenship, although the inhabitants were chiefly of German origin. This denial of self-determination has caused indescribable misery to the national minorities of Hungary, who now form minorities in countries which they did not choose. These peoples include two-and-one-half million Slovaks, one-and-one-half million Germans, five hundred thousand Ruthenians, one hundred thousand Bunyevacs and about one million seven hundred thousand Croats, the last two now belonging to Yugo-Slavia, formerly known as Serbia. Yugo-Slavia also received Montenegro, part of Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina. Neither Herzegovina nor Croatia ever belonged to Serbia and Croatia is still anxious for autonomy.

The failure to carry out Woodrow Wilson's fourteen points, on which the Armistice was based, brought catastrophe to the conquered and near-bankruptcy to the victorious nations.

THE FOLLOWING ARE PRESIDENT WILSON'S FOURTEEN POINTS:

I. "Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view."

II. "Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants."

III. "The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance."

IV. "Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety."

V. "A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined."

VI. "The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than welcome, assistance of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy."

VII. "Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common

with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired."

VIII. "All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all."

IX. "A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality."

X. "The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development."

XI. "Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan States to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan States should be entered into."

XII. "The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees."

XIII. "An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant."

XIV. “A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.”

10. HUNGARY AFTER THE WAR

THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

The bridge of history from pre-war Hungary to Hungary of today is the October revolution of 1918, which, for a short period, most unfortunately placed Károlyi and his advisers in power. This brief régime brought more loss and catastrophe to the thousand-year-old nation than the World War; even more than the Battle of Mohács in 1526, when the Turks came and oppressed the country for a hundred and fifty years.

On October 31, the day after his appointment as Premier by Charles IV. (against the advice of Count Tisza), after delivering his oath to King and Constitution, Károlyi telephoned from Budapest to Vienna, asking Charles IV. for his immediate abdication of the throne of Hungary. A few days later Count Tisza was assassinated. Károlyi, whose control of the government lasted until March 22, 1919, became the tool of the Cabinet.

The Bolshevik government[1] followed Károlyi, and tried to carry out the policies of Soviet Russia. Most of the European powers were strongly opposed to the Károlyi, as well as to the Bolshevik, government. Great Britain was the first European power to aid the thousand-year-old National State. The Council of Four sent the Boer General, Smuts, to direct Hungary in establishing a satisfactory line of demarcation for her new frontiers. However, the Bolshevik government clung shrewdly to its power and refused to negotiate with the neighbouring nations through General Smuts. The Entente representative, realizing the futility of his mission, left Budapest within a few hours of his arrival. Not only for strategical but for political reasons, the Czechs occupied several cities in North Hungary, ignoring the agreement of non-occupation. A Red Hungarian army, led by Colonel Stromfeld, directed a general attack upon the violators and drove them back to

1 The Hungarian Communist Party was organized in a Moscow hotel on November 4, 1918, when a group of Hungarian prisoners of war and Communist sympathizers formed a Central Committee and dispatched members to Hungary to propagate Bolshevik ideas and radicalize Károlyi's government.

the Carpathian Mountains. The advance of the Hungarian Red army, and at the same time the retreat of the Czechs, was stopped by an unequivocal command to Béla Kun from Clémenceau, who, at the instigation of Mr. Benes, threatened him with the whole weight of the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers to interfere, if the territories already gained were not immediately evacuated by the victorious Red army. In the meanwhile the Communist régime in Hungary lost much, day by day, because of the rising dissatisfaction of the terror-stricken Hungarian population. The Red army, which became engaged in a battle with the Rumanian army along the River Tisza, was too little disciplined to withstand the Rumanian attack. The Hungarian Red army was ordered to a general retreat and the Rumanian troops, contrary to the orders of the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers, entered Budapest on the first day of August, 1919, under the pretense of saving Hungary from Bolshevism. In reality they had only selfish purposes in disregarding the Armistice, and the agreements of the Treaty of Trianon, concluded between the Allied Powers and Hungary.

The Rumanians stole everything movable; enormous quantities of grain, fodder, cattle, horses, railway coaches and locomotives, telephone outfits, typewriters, bed linen from prisons, hospitals, military barracks, everything portable from hotels and private houses. They sacked and looted Hungary, carrying away everything by special trains to Rumania.

General Bandholtz[2], the head of the United States military mission in Budapest, prevented the Rumanians, with his official authority, from robbing the Royal Museum of Arts. It required thirteen notes and telegrams from the Council of the Allied nations to drive the Rumanians from Budapest. After an official investigation the Council of the Allied Powers reported that the public property of Hungary alone was damaged by the Rumanians to the extent of eight billion dollars. (And this happened after the Armistice.)

The Rumanians wanted to add as many Magyars as possible to their new provinces in order to strengthen their position against Russia. This the Supreme Council of the Allies refused to allow. It issued the following report on August 8, 1921: *"Les Roumains violent les decisions de la Conference et les*

2 See: H.H. Bandholtz: *An Undiplomatic Diary*, ISBN: 0-9665734-6-3

droits éléinentaires de l'humanité." During the revolution of 1848, Louis Kossuth had tried to convince the political leaders of Rumania of the necessity for their close cooperation with Hungary because of the Russian peril. Then and in the World War, Rumania accepted Slavic protection.

In this chaotic state of affairs a new Hungarian government was formed in the City of Arad by Julius Károlyi, a cousin of Michael Károlyi. But Count Stephen Bethlen had already established in Vienna a committee to organize an Hungarian government. The bankrupt Soviet agents in Hungary were replaced by a Socialistic government. Peidl, the new leader, and his associates were arrested on August 2, 1919, by members of a counterrevolution. Stephen Friedrich then formed a cabinet and the Rumanian troops were finally forced to leave Budapest.

The first election for a National Assembly was held during January and February, 1920. The House of Magnates, the upper house, was abolished, the new legislative body retaining only the Chamber of Deputies. Elections were held on the basis of secret and universal suffrage, which brought a great majority of Conservatives and Christian Nationalists and small landowners into the life of the new Hungarian Parliament. Socialists were not elected. The Assembly elected Admiral Horthy, the late Commander-in-Chief of the Austro-Hungarian fleet, Regent of Hungary. He arrived in Budapest on November 16, 1919, with a newly organized national army. Hungary is a kingdom, but, in the absence of a King, the Governor or Regent is the Chief Executive, although without the royal prerogatives laid down in the Constitution of Hungary.

Count Albert Apponyi and the Hungarian Peace Delegation were interned by the French at the Château Madrid in Neuilly on January 8, 1920. Apponyi protested against Millerand's demands and, after a fruitless struggle for his country's interests, resigned as head of the Peace Commission of Hungary because he could not sign what he believed to be the death warrant of Hungary. Another commission was appointed to sign the Treaty of Trianon, which was designed to meet the ambitions of the defunct Empire of the Tzars.

THE WHITE TERROR AND THE JEWISH QUESTION

The pre-war wealth of Hungary was estimated at 41,520,000 billion crowns. The costs of the war for the Dual Monarchy amounted to 69,000,000 billions, of which Hungary's part was 26,116,000 billion crowns. After Károlyi and his confederates encouraged the mutiny of troops at the front, disorganization of the army took place in the greatest confusion. War materials valued at 15 billion crowns as well as materials valued at 300,million crowns, and adaptable to conversion in time of peace, were either destroyed or lost. The Károlyi régime and the Bolsheviks further debilitated the treasury to the extent of 12,000 million crowns. The pre-war national debt amounted to 8,000, million crowns, and the present liabilities are 80,000 million crowns. Hungary's loss, apart from the burden of her debt, is now being estimated by experts. How large an amount the total will come to may be illustrated by the fact that Colonel Lorée of the French general staff set 50,000,000,000 crowns as an approximate figure for the damage done by the Rumanian occupation alone.

Previous to the war Hungarian territory included 28,227,446 acres. 70.7 per cent of this original Hungary was expropriated by the decree of the Peace Conference. The amputation of this territory has meant the loss of the greatest part of Hungary's national wealth. Hungary has been deprived of 61.6 per cent of its arable soil, 86.6 per cent of its forests, 72 per cent of its pastures, 76.6 per cent of its meadows, 78.2 per cent of its gardens, 37.7 per cent of its vineyards, 48.6 per cent of its reeds, 68.4 per cent of its cattle, 55.6 per cent of its pigs, 60.3 per cent of its horses, 74.2 per cent of its sheep, 89.6 per cent of its wool production, 55.5 per cent of its sugar production, 20 per cent of its tobacco cultivation, 48 per cent of its output in coal, 21 per cent of its peat, 100 per cent of its natural gas sources, 100 per cent of its oil supply, 80 per cent of its iron mines, 100 per cent of its salt mines, and 100 per cent of its silver and gold mines. Hungary, thus bereft by one stroke of the pen of the greatest part of its economic resources, faces a sinister struggle against stagnation and disintegration in trade and industry.

The nation recovered slowly from effects of the radical Socialistic Károlyi government and the régime of the Soviet emissaries in Hungary. The inhuman murders and "third-degree" prosecutions which were daily

occurrences under the Moscow rule created bitter feeling throughout the country. Because Béla Kun's commissaries were chiefly Jews[3] an anti-Semitic feeling developed in Hungary, where formerly the Jews had occupied a position of high esteem.

The reactionary Hungarians organized themselves in a partly political, partly social association, called the Awakening Hungarians. This organization was a result of the bitter post-war and revolutionary struggles, and its supporters resorted in their desperation to despicable methods of persecuting innocent citizens. Certain leaders of these armed groups became conspicuous and achieved political influence in their attempts to excite a public hatred against the Jewish inhabitants of the country. Anti-Semitism had never been a feeling shared by the majority of the Hungarian people, by the Hungarian Parliament, or by any Hungarian government. Abnormal social and political conditions, which always prevail after revolutions, produced the reactionary sentiments among certain elements.

Seven years ago (in 1927) the government started to take active steps against the anti-Semitic factions in an attempt to put an end to the deplorable activities that were unworthy of a highly civilized people. Soon after the breakdown of the Soviet régime, the anti-Semitic tendencies lost their significance, although propaganda, especially that conducted by the Succession States, at times contrived to re-awaken minor disturbances which the government succeeded in suppressing and finally subduing. However, in Hungary the power of the reactionary groups has been broken forever by the strong Bethlen government, and today the Jewish question scarcely exists. Much has been spoken and written concerning the *numerus clausus* in Hungarian universities. By *numerus clausus* is meant the law which provides that of the students entering colleges and universities only a specific percentage may be of other than Hungarian origin. Such policies are not in accord with the true principles of a democratic constitution, since they restrict education. The law was the inevitable result of the collapse of pre-war Hungary and the unfortunate condition which followed the war. The

3 In fact, of the 45 Communist commissars 30 were Jews. Among these, 8 of the top ten ideological leaders were Jews(Ed.).

regulation aspired to a direction of the Hungarian youth toward practical business careers in preference to the already overcrowded professions.

These circumstances are not reported to excuse the law, but are offered as an explanation of the political and social forces which inspired it. In discussion of the *numerus clausus*, it should be understood that the underlying principle was a control of the influx of students to the portals of higher learning by a proportion between the alien races and nationalities, and the Hungarian people within the country. The chief object was to prevent the development of an intellectual proletariat for which in dismembered Hungary adequate positions were lacking. The law was not directed against the Jews; however, it is conceivable that, since the leaders of the Communist Party and the overwhelming majority of the Soviet government in Hungary were recruited from the ranks of the Jewish intelligentsia, the trend of the political atmosphere was in the direction of reducing the control by an educated Jewish proletariat, which had come to be utterly out of proportion to the Hungarian population. As a matter of fact, the law was directed toward every alien race or nationality in order to protect the Hungarian race from absorption by any other race, be it Jewish or Chinese. This, then, is an explanation of the *numerus clausus* which agitated public opinion in Europe and America[4]. The Jewish Alliance raised many protests against the treatment of the Jews in Hungary, denying that Jews in any country can be classed as a foreign race if they have been amalgamated with that country for generations. That these protests had very little foundation is proved by the fact that the loyal Jewish element in Hungary itself objected to this outside interference in Hungarian internal affairs.

The spirit of the *numerus clausus* was re-stated by the Prime Minister of Hungary in October, 1927, when he declared in Parliament that the law should remain intact. In the future only students who excelled, regardless of religion, would be admitted to the institutions of higher learning. This proclamation was an assertion of the right basis for any enlightened and progressive educational program. At the same time the much-debated Jewish

4 In America during the later decades of the 20th century any criticism of Hungary's 'numerus clausus' was moot in the light of federally sanctioned 'affirmative action' programs. [Ed.]

question was settled conclusively in accordance with the principles of true liberalism and democracy.

JEREMIAH SMITH OF BOSTON BALANCES THE HUNGARIAN FINANCES

The country has made a rapid recovery in the past few years from the consequences of war and revolution, having balanced its budget and stabilized its currency after the $50,000,000 International Reconstruction Loan which was made and issued under the direction of the League of Nations in 1924. Convincing proof of the reinstatement of Hungarian credit is indicated by the fact that several leading financial houses in New York made bids for the recent loan of the City of Budapest; this business was transacted finally by the Bankers Trust Company of New York.

The financial reconstruction of Hungary has been the most important accomplishment in Hungarian history since the conclusion of the Peace Treaty of Trianon. This event has a singular interest for Americans because the difficult task of disentangling the puzzle of the reconstruction was entrusted to a distinguished citizen of Boston, Mr. Jeremiah Smith, Jr. Mr. Smith's remarkable success is today so universally recognized that it seems almost superfluous to emphasize his work. The immensity of the task entrusted to him, and the splendid results which were brought about through his expert knowledge and understanding of the local situation, were concisely outlined by Mr. H. Wilson Harris. Mr. Harris, Parliamentary Secretary of Great Britain, League of Nations Union, London, Editor of *Headway*, and diplomatic correspondent of the *Daily News* in London, delivered an address on the Danubian and Balkan States at the National Conference on International Problems and Relations, which was held under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace with the cooperation of the Academy of Political Science, on May 13, 1926, at Briarcliff, New York. The following is from Mr. Harris' address:

"It is rather unfortunate that we have no one here qualified, so far as I know, to deal with the kindred problem of Hungary. The problem of Hungary—or rather the treatment of that problem—is in some ways even more instructive than the treatment of the economic problem in Austria, for, though Austria had the honour of being the pioneer as a subject of experiment, in the case of

Hungary it was possible to profit by the experience gained in the working of the Austrian scheme, and therefore, successful as the Austrian scheme has been—as Professor Mises has very clearly shown—the Hungarian scheme has been much more strikingly successful. Certain political difficulties in the way of launching that scheme were in some respects greater, because, while no one ever suspected Austria of any malign intentions against its neighbours, there were states which rightly or wrongly did entertain that suspicion in regard to Hungary, and they were therefore less willing to make the arrangements necessary before the financial reconstruction of Hungary should be undertaken.

"There is another reason why I wish we had had an account of the Hungarian scheme here; as everyone knows, the League of Nations, when it had to find a High Commissioner to administer the scheme at the Hungarian capital, Budapest, came to this side of the Atlantic to find him and appointed Mr. Jeremiah Smith, Jr., of Boston. I am speaking subject to no correction whatsoever when I say that no man who has served the League of Nations in one capacity or another has served it with more unqualified success than Mr. Jeremiah Smith. He discharged his rather delicate duties with all the delicacy that they required; he has obtained the good will of the Hungarian government and on the practical side he has shown evidence of all the ability that is necessary in a position of that sort. If I may just mention one single factor before sitting down, I should like to say that when Mr. Jeremiah Smith gave an account of the first year's working of the Hungarian scheme, he had a very remarkable result to report. In Hungary, as in Austria, the experts who planned out the scheme had to face the problem of how expenditure and revenue could be balanced. Expenditure had to be reduced by cutting down superfluous civil servants and superfluous costs of one kind or another; revenue had to be raised by gradually increasing the taxes, and it was estimated at the outset that after one year's working, the deficit of the Hungarian budget ought to have been brought down to a figure of 100,000,000 gold crowns. When Mr. Jeremiah Smith came to Geneva to report on the first year's working, he was able to tell the Council of the League of Nations that not only was there no deficit at all in the Hungarian budget, but that instead of the expected deficit of 100 million gold crowns, there was an actual surplus in hand of 63,000,000 gold crowns; so that, instead of the external loan which was raised for the purpose of balancing the budget having to be used for that purpose, it was possible to divert some of it to constructive expenditures such

as improving the postal and telegraph systems and the electrification of some of the railroads."

It should be added that Mr. Smith succeeded in winning not only the esteem of the Hungarian nation for the consummation of his task, but also the sympathy of the Hungarian people, who call him "our Jeremiah." Since the days of Kossuth, no single individual has contributed more toward welding a strong and sympathetic relationship between the United States and Hungary than Mr. Jeremiah Smith, Jr., of Boston.

Credit of the successful fulfillment of the League's reconstruction plan is due also to the Hungarian government which, under the able leadership of Count Stephen Bethlen, supported with good faith and true sincerity the High-Commissioner of the League of Nations. Count Bethlen directed the prompt execution of the legislative and administrative measures that were requisite for the smooth operation of the reconstruction plan. The Bethlen family has included many personalities prominent in Hungary's political life since the thirteenth century. Gabriel Bethlen, the reigning Duke of the then independent principality of Transylvania, and a great statesman and ruler of the seventeenth century, was an ancestor of the present Prime Minister. But not one of his patriotic ancestors, and few of his predecessors, faced so difficult a task in government as this which confronted Stephen Bethlen. Having assumed the administration of the government after the sufferings of four-and-a-half years of war, the devastating effect of two revolutions, and the still more desolating consequences of the Treaty of Trianon, Count Bethlen had to cope with almost insurmountable difficulties. Internally he had to reorganize and readjust the chaotic administration of a country which had lost two-thirds of its territory, two-thirds of its population, and nearly all its natural resources. He had to appease public sentiment, torn as it was by unequaled suffering. Furthermore, he had to create from the meagre possibilities left by the Peace Treaty a solid basis on which the economic and financial life of the nation could be resumed. Externally he found himself isolated among enemies and surrounded by the Succession States of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire, organized into the Little Entente, for the avowed purpose of encircling and subduing, by means of an economic and political iron-ring, that little Hungary which was left.

In view of all the difficulties and restrictions, Count Bethlen's achievement is miraculous. He improved also the material position of Hungary, so that the

Magyars may claim today the friendship and good will of many people who regarded them, only a few years ago, as enemies. He has led Hungary, in a very short space of time, to the ranks of the best governed countries of Europe; he has established a reliable government; he has carried on an honest and efficient public administration. And since the financial reconstruction with its crushing obligations, he has sustained a balanced budget which enables the nation to look forward with reasonable expectation to further progress and independence.

THE TRAGEDY OF CHARLES IV.

In 1920 Count Stephen Bethlen was appointed Premier, with the support of the majority of the Hungarian Parliament. In March 1921, Charles IV., living in Luzerne, Switzerland, attempted upon advice of his Hungarian adherents to return to Hungary. His plan was to regain, and take possession of, the throne of Hungary—a plan which, if successful, would have greatly endangered the safety of Hungary. The King and Queen flew to Hungary in an aeroplane, and a few military detachments tried to protect their entry into the Royal Palace at Budapest. The Bethlen government faced a very dangerous and embarrassing situation. The neighbouring Succession States, composed of parts of pre-war Hungary, protested vigorously against the arrival of Charles IV., and were seriously thinking of marching into Hungary. This time the royal couple took the advice given them to leave the country again.

As to the tragedy of Charles IV., Hungary issued the so-called "White Book" which contains the facts about the two visits of the unfortunate King and the Queen. The picture in the "White Book" about the catastrophic events contains the mere facts. Unfortunately for the King, he bad already been surrounded in Switzerland by a crowd of dangerous adventurers, which crowd influenced the King. Unfortunately, this influence could not be counterbalanced by that of the loyal and distinguished Hungarian members of the legitimist party. Although, especially, the second attempt of Charles IV. to regain his lost throne had been encouraged by France, the fact remains that the role of France had been a two-fold one, and as to the Little Entente, it simply waited for the opportunity to "make the last deal of the war" and to divide Hungary among itself.

It is known that Count Bethlen wrote to the King advising him not to return to Hungary. Moreover, even the Hungarian legitimists headed by Count

Andrássy did not encourage the King to this disastrous enterprise. The Hungarian "White Book" describes the details of the journey in a tone not very favourable to the entourage of the late King. Count Bethlen writes in the *Encyclopedia Britannica:*

"On October 20, 1921, King Charles IV. left Switzerland with Queen Zita in an aeroplane and arrived after a few hours in northwest Hungary at the small place, Dénesfa. One battalion of field gendarmes and other troops put themselves at the disposal of the King, who appointed his own government and proceeded on the twenty-second of October for Budapest, followed by his loyal troops, who, after their arrival in Budapest, took possession of the telegraph, telephone and postal communications. As soon as the government was informed about these happenings, it issued a declaration, according to which it was expressed that the King has no right to exercise his royal prerogatives and demanded that His Majesty instantly leave Hungarian territory. The King and his troops were still outside of Budapest. The Regent of Hungary, Admiral Horthy, sent a special letter to the King telling him that if he would enter Budapest it would mean the final catastrophe and end of Hungary. The King was advised in this letter to come alone without his troops and Cabinet and to clear the situation at a conference, which should be composed of members of the lawful Cabinet of Hungary and the representatives of the Entente in Budapest. In vain; the King refused to accept any interference and proceeded to Budapest. Next morning, October 23, occurred a bloody encounter between the troops of the King and the Bethlen government, at Buda-Örs, in the neighbourhood of the capital of Hungary. The royal troops retired and were dispersed by the government troops."Dark clouds gathered again over the destiny of Hungary as Yugo-Slavia and Czecho-Slovakia ordered the mobilization of their armies. The council of Ambassadors demanded on October 31, 1921, the dethroning of Charles IV. and the Habsburg dynasty. On November 3, the Bethlen government introduced a new law in which the sovereign rights of Charles IV. were annulled forever.

The Hungarian government reached a compromise with the representatives of the great Powers of Europe, that without the consent of the council of Ambassadors Hungary would not undertake any action regarding the "question of the King." Charles IV. and the Queen had been captured and temporarily interned in the picturesque monastery of the Cistercian Order in the thousand-year-old city of Zirc. By order of the Council of the Allied

Ambassadors of the Entente, Charles and his Queen embarked on November 1, 1921, on the Royal British battle-monitor "Glow Worm," and left Hungary on the Danube, via the Black Sea, and the Mediterranean, for Funchal, the capital city of the Island of Madeira.

The sunshine of Madeira was unable to heal the effects of the terrible shocks suffered by Charles IV. He died there on April 2, 1922.

In spite of the law which has dethroned the Habsburgs, the Hungarian legitimist party is very loyal to the Royal Family and maintains permanently one or two of their representatives with Prince Otto, the son of Charles IV., and his mother.

Although Hungary remained a constitutional kingdom, at the present time there is no King and no "king question" in Hungary.

The country under the able management of the Bethlen government soon quieted down.

11. THE HUNGARIAN CONSTITUTION

Hungary, one of the oldest national states in Europe, adopted a constitutional form of government in 1031. Until after the fourteenth century, Hungary's international relations were not constitutionally conducted with the neighbouring countries. From the reign of St. Stephen until 1222, the Hungarian nobility were in constant fear that the royal power would completely usurp their own power. Accordingly, in 1222, they forced the King to sign "the Golden Bulla," the Hungarian Magna Charta, only seven years younger than its English counterpart.

The last Habsburg King of Hungary, Charles IV., in his declaration of November 13, 1918, resigned as Chief Executive of the State. On November 16, 1918, the Hungarian Parliament dissolved itself and the Upper House discontinued sessions. Revolutionary governments then continued the business of the government, disregarding the existence of the Hungarian Constitution. After the bankruptcy of these governments, it was necessary to change the constitution and to fix the duties of the Chief Executive. The governments of Friedrich and Huszár undertook this task and on August 7, 1919, introduced, by governmental orders, the new elections by universal, secret, equal, indirect and obligatory suffrage.

The new Hungarian Assembly was elected by this system and held its first session on February 16, 1920. This Assembly endorsed all the governmental orders providing for the election of the present Parliament, and declared itself the highest representative with power to exercise the sovereignty of the nation. (Law I. from 1920.) The National Assembly elected as Governor, Nicholas Horthy de Nagybánya, for the office of the Chief Executive of the country; it declared that the old Constitution remained and to it added amendments, one of which ended the mutual relation between Austria and Hungary (amendment of the law of 1920, II.).

The hereditary rights of the House of Habsburg to the Hungarian throne ceased to exist after 1921, when, on account of foreign pressure, the National Assembly enacted a new law declaring that the Habsburgs forever had lost their rights to the throne of Hungary and that the dynasty as well as the Pragmatic Sanction of 1725 ceased to exist for new Hungary. At the same

time the right of the nation to elect a new king was enacted and a solemn declaration was made by the Hungarian Nation not to undertake anything regarding the question of a king without a previous consultation with, and the approval of, the great Powers of Europe.

Charles IV. left the country in October, 1921, although he did not abdicate the throne of Hungary. According to the theory of the legitimist party, Charles IV. only resigned his rights as Chief Executive. After the October Revolution, the National Assembly enacted new constitutional laws regarding the King. These laws are still valid and according to them the King of Hungary is absent from the country, which means that at present Hungary is a constitutional kingdom without a king. Even in the absence of a king all offices, courts and institutions remain royal with the coat of arms of the Kingdom of Hungary. The governor is the Chief Executive, but does not exercise the royal prerogatives.

The Hungarian Parliament existed under the one-house system Until the Upper House was again introduced in 1925. This measure went into effect in November, 1926.

A short time ago the Hungarian Parliament enacted a law in which the immortal and everlasting achievements of Kossuth in regard to the regeneration of Hungary were officially esteemed and valued.

Under the Habsburg rule such an enactment in Parliament would have been impossible, since Kossuth never recognized the Habsburgs as long as he lived.

Count Bethlen, the present Premier of Hungary, introduced this act as follows: “Inspired by the public sentiment of Hungary, which erected the glorious monument of Kossuth standing before our Parliament, the Hungarian National Parliament wishes to express in permanent form its everlasting gratitude and indebtedness to that immortal man who as an apostle of constitutional freedom, man’s equality, and the spirit of justice, fought so heroically for the future of this country. The re-birth of Hungary, the independence and constitutional development of the country, and the hope of our national future, are closely connected with Kossuth, and the nation wishes to testify with this law its never ceasing memories for her great son, . . .“ This wording was incorporated in the constitutional law of the

Hungarian Parliament 79 years after Kossuth's revolt against the tyranny of the Habsburgs.

KOSSUTH'S SPIRIT ENACTED AS LAW IN THE REBIRTH OF HUNGARY

Francis Deák, a contemporary of Kossuth, said: "History will connect the transformation of Hungary with the name of Kossuth, who in 1848 initiated the Constitution and carried it through with unwearied energy. In spite of subsequent events that part of his work remained and will remain as long as our country exists. The gratitude of the people will always be his."

Count Albert Apponyi rose in the Hungarian Parliament on March 23, 1894, when the news of Kossuth's death was officially announced and said: "The living are shrouded in the fog of controversy, in which the transitory opinions of contemporaries are as but feeble, flickering rushlights. Then comes the rough wind of death: the mist is dispersed, the petty lamps are extinguished and the Sun of History arises. And now in the light of that Rising Sun we begin to see what Kossuth was. Let us consider what Hungary was before he put his hand to the wheel. Was it a nation? Was it a State? Was it free? Did it belong to the family of European nations? According to law and historical tradition, yes. But in reality? In reality it was torn in pieces by the contrasts presented by class privilege and servitude. It had no independent Government. It was a province which rendered homage to an alien power, in spite of the futile protests of an impotent Diet. The people were sundered from, and lagged behind, the rest of the civilized world. The national consciousness was only just waking to life. . . . And today? Today, thank God, we are a united nation of free and equal citizens, whose representative assembly is endowed with a decisive influence: a worthy sister nation of other civilized peoples; a nation which feels itself to be an independent State, and, imbued with that consciousness, determines its own fate. The difference between the Hungary of the past and the Hungary of today tells us what Louis Kossuth was. He found the former and created the latter. . . . The historic calling of the Magyar nation and the national development finds its symbol in the name of Louis Kossuth. That is the secret of the country's feeling for him, that is the measure of our veneration and of our gratitude." (*Apponyi Albert Gróf Beszédei*, Budapest, 1897, II, 273, sqq.)

THE KING AND CONSTITUTION

According to the Constitution, the King is the head of the Hungarian State and in his person is embodied the unity of the Hungarian Kingdom. Supreme power over the State is not invested entirely in his person, since the nation shares in this sovereignty through the votes of the citizens who participate in this constitutional way through their representatives in the Hungarian Parliament. The Deputies of the Hungarian people in the Parliament make the laws for the country, which are then sanctioned by the King. There is, therefore, a joint sovereignty between the King and people. The famous compromise between King and country in 1867 was the work of Francis Deák. This compromise recognized the laws passed and enacted in the revolutionary Parliament of 1848 and 1849, confirming and consolidating the relationship of the Hungarian crown with Hungary. After 1867, the royal civil lists paid by both Austria and Hungary amounted in each case to 11,300,000 gold crowns.

According to the Constitution, the King of Hungary has full royal power after he has been crowned with the Sacred Crown of St. Stephen. Only after this act can he assume his executive and legislative functions.[1] The act of coronation proceeds through the Hungarian Parliament. The King receives the diploma of the coronation after taking the Sacred Oath to keep the Constitution of Hungary, without which he is not considered a lawful King. The oath must be taken in the presence of the entire Parliament. For such an occasion, it is customary for Parliament to assemble, clad in the picturesque old national costumes, in the Coronation Church of Budapest. The Prince Cardinal, assisted by all the other Cardinals of Hungary, and usually the Premier of the Hungarian Government, places the Crown on the head of the King, who then takes the oath.

The Sacred Crown is the symbol of the Hungarian National State. The upper part was given, before the year 1000, to St. Stephen, the first Christian King of Hungary, by Pope Sylvester, and the lower part by the Greek Emperor Ducas.

1 There have been several kings who disregarded the constitutional laws of Hungary.

The joint political composition—the symbol—of the crown means that the King and people together make the crown, which is determined by the law: "*totum corpus Sacrae Regni Coronae.*" The King is the head and the people represented in the Parliament compose the other parts of the national body. The Hungarian Constitution must not suffer in any way should the King of Hungary have other crowns from other countries at the same time.

The King of Hungary is called "Apostolic Majesty." King Andrew II. of the House of Arpád was the first to take this title, calling himself Andrew of Jerusalem because he helped Christianity by furnishing armies to secure the Holy Land for the Church. The first Habsburg to use this title was Maria Theresa.

Money for the country is issued in the name of the King. The parliament votes and issues the Budget of the State, prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The King has a right to participate in the Legislature (Art. XII. from 1791) and holds the highest executive power (Art. III. from 1848). The constitution makes it imperative for him to participate in all enterprises with the responsible and constitutional government of Hungary, a government generally chosen from the Parliament. The King has the same right as the nation to convoke the Parliament, which, according to the Constitution, is convoked for five years. Each session during these five years must be convoked and dissolved by the King upon the advice of his responsible Government. The King can dissolve the Parliament before the session is over. He also sanctions each law. In the earlier centuries, all free Hungarians (freemen) and members of the Nobility and Clergy could appear in the open session of the Parliament. Later, in the 16th and 17th centuries, the Constitution was reorganized and the Parliament divided into two parts, the House of Commons and the House of Magnates. In the Lower House sat the lower Nobility and the representatives of the Free Cities and, in the Upper House, the Prelates of the Church and the Magnates exercised their constitutional rights as legislators.

The new constitutional laws (Paragraph I. of 1920) respect the old Constitution and provide for the full sovereignty of the Parliament in all executive matters until the question of a king is finally settled. For this no date has been set, and the chief executive rights have been vested in the Regent of Hungary, elected by the Hungarian Parliament. The rights of the Regent are

more or less the same as those of the King as laid down in the Constitution. The power to create nobility is a royal prerogative of the Kings of Hungary, powers which the Regent cannot exercise, According to the old constitution, the Kings sanctioned the laws enacted by the Parliament, but the Regent only promulgates or pronounces the law to the nation. The Kings exercised an absolute veto right regarding the laws enacted by the Parliament while the Regent has only a suspensive veto. According to the Constitution and practice in the Parliament, the Hungarian Legislature, a liberal and democratic body, is able to fight the veto rights of the Chief Executive.

SUFFRAGE AND ELECTION

The sovereign power of the Legislature is exercised by the postwar Parliament which is composed of two Houses, the House of Representatives or the Lower House, and the House of Magnates or the Upper House. Members of the House of Representatives are elected for five years and number, according to a new law passed in 1926, 245 members elected by 210 districts.

The political maturity of the people has an important bearing on the election of the Legislature since laws are an integral part of a nation and its people. In 199 out of the 210 districts, the election is performed publicly or with open votes since these districts are rural and agricultural and the majority of the population is not politically intelligent. The remaining eleven districts, from which 46 members are elected, are in cities and industrial centres where the voters are more intelligent, and there the voting is secret.

At the last election in Hungary, according to the publication of the "*Hungarian Statistical Review*," about forty political factions sent 516 candidates to the polls. About two-thirds of these candidates belonged to the greatest political party of Hungary, the United Party, the backbone of the present government: 10.9 per cent belonged to the Christian Agricultural Party of small farmers; 9.3 per cent to the Left Wing of the House of Representatives, and 9.1 per cent to no party at all. In the districts where voting was secret, the Democrats and Social Democrats had 43 per cent of the candidates. The Race Defender Party also showed a good percentage.

Every Hungarian citizen who is at least twenty-four years of age, who has been a citizen for at least ten years, who has had a permanent seat of two years in the same community and is a graduate of a four-year course in an Hungarian Folk

School, is entitled by law to election. Requirements are the same for women except that they must be at least thirty years of age, have finished a six years' course in an Hungarian Folk School and have at least three legitimate children or of independent means. Persons with war decorations and high school graduates are entitled to election before they are twenty-four years of age. The national law lays great stress on bravery, patriotism, intelligence and education.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NEW UPPER HOUSE

With law XXII., of November 15, 1926, the new Upper House of the Hungarian Parliament was organized to perform the duties of the pre-war House of Magnates. The members of the Upper House are qualified by their State office, by election and by appointment by the Chief Executive upon the recommendation of the constitutional government.

There are two classes of offices which qualify their holders to be members of the Upper House. The first includes all the dignitaries of the State of Hungary whose offices existed under the old Constitution—the two guards of the Sacred Crown, the President and Vice-President of the Supreme Court, the President and the Vice-President of the Court for Jurisdiction, the President of the Court of Second Instances, the Crown Attorney, the Commander-in-Chief of the national army and the President of the National Bank of Hungary. Members of the various religions make up the second class. The Roman Catholic Church is represented by the Prince Cardinal of Hungary, the Archbishops of Kalocsa and Eger, the Bishops of Csanád, Györ, Hajdudorog, Pécs, Székesfehérvár, Szombathely, Vác, Veszprém, the Grand Abbot of Pannonhalma, the Abbot of Zirc, and the Abbot of the order of the Piarist's. The three oldest bishops and the three lay supervisors of the Evangelical Reformed Church, the oldest bishop and the lay and district supervisor of the Evangelical Augsburg Confession, the oldest chairman of the Unitarian Church, the Bishop of Buda of the Greek Oriental Church and two members of the Jewish denominations, elected for a lifetime are eligible for membership in the Upper House.

Elected members of the Upper House hold office for ten years and can be re-elected at the end of that time. Reserve members who take up their duties in

case of the death or disability of regular members are also elected. The date of the election is fixed by the Secretary of the Interior. It is held every fifth year by secret ballot. In order to qualify for election to the Upper House, Hungarian citizens must be members of the Hungarian higher nobility, representatives of the county and municipal jurisdictions or representatives of agriculture, industry, commerce, science, art, education or of the professions and vocations prescribed by the law.

The eligible members of the higher nobility are those whose families enjoyed the hereditary right of membership in the old Hungarian House of Magnates. They must be owners of an estate which pays at least 2,000 pengös direct State and land taxes and they must be at least twenty-four years of age. For those who hold Doctors' degrees, have been judges, or are members of the Hungarian Royal Academy of Sciences, the taxes are estimated at double their value. All members of the House of Habsburg who are Hungarian citizens of legal age and are permanent residents of Hungary fulfill these requirements. An official list of these noble families is prepared and corrected according to law by the President of the House of Magnates, supervised by the Secretary of the Interior and only those on it can vote. They elect among themselves half of the number of those elected by counties and municipalities to the Upper House.

Cities and counties elect their own representatives for the House of Magnates in the sessions of their official bodies. The law provides that the heads of cities and counties and their officials are not eligible. This does not include aldermen. Members are elected by organizations and institutions by secret ballot. The Chambers of Commerce and of Industry elect six members; the State Chamber of Agriculture, six members; the Bar Association, two members; the Bar Association for the Royal Notaries, two members; the Organization of Knights, an organization composed of the knighted heroes of the World War, one member; the Royal Hungarian Academy of Sciences, three members; and the Royal University of Budapest elects one member from each faculty. The other Hungarian Universities each elect one member; the Technical University of Budapest elects one member; the Hungarian Collective University, one member; the High School for Mining and Forestry, one member; the Agricultural High Schools, one member; the High School for Art, one member; the State High School for Music, one member; and the Stock and Corn Exchange elects one member. Professions designated by the law are also represented in the House of Magnates. The Chamber of

Agriculture, the Chamber of Engineers, the Organization of Knights, and the Stock and Corn Exchanges elect their representatives in their regular meetings.

The Governor of Hungary can appoint forty members to the House of Magnates upon the suggestion of the government. These appointments justly represent all the possible creeds and professions of the country. For example, even if the Chamber of Physicians is not yet organized, the government generally appoints one prominent physician to the Upper House.

The organization and jurisdiction of the Upper House is laid down in the Constitution, law III., No. 37 of 1848. The government is compelled to submit the yearly budget and all accountings of the country to the Upper House for approval. The budget is prepared and decided upon by the Lower House and its provisions cannot be changed by the Upper House.

Both Houses are compelled by law to bring every question or law to a final decision within six months after the first presentation. If either House does not accept the law, the various committees of the two Houses try to reach a compromise in a joint sitting. If no compromise is concluded within six months, the Lower House is authorized to take the law to the Chief Executive for final endorsement, regardless of the decision of the Upper House. This law applies to the budget. In case of a disagreement with the Upper House, should the Lower House present the law to the Governor for final publication and should the Governor not use his right to return the law for reconsideration, he is authorized to publish the law, thus making it valid. He can also dissolve the Parliament. If, after convoking the newly elected Parliament, the law is again voted on, the Chief Executive can publish it as valid within fifteen days.

At the present time, every law published ends with the following declaration:

"I order herewith the publication of this law as the will of the nation, which law I promise to keep and provide that it shall be kept by the people of Hungary.

Signed: Governor of Hungary - Countersigned: Royal Hungarian Prime Minister."

The business procedure of the two Houses is similar. They elect a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Major Domo and the Secretaries by secret ballot. The officials of the Lower House receive an annual salary. The members of the House of Magnates receive no pay except the compensation allowed to members who are not residents of Budapest. The first meeting of the House of Magnates is called by a written invitation to the members from the chief executive of the country. Such letters or mandates must be presented to the President of the House of Magnates within fifteen days after the opening of the first session. They are investigated and verified by other committees. Elections can be protested and the incompatibility of members regulated.

The lawful rights and duties of the Chief Executive toward both Houses are those outlined in laws I. and XVII., of 1920, for the unicameral system or the National Assembly. Should the office of the Governor be vacated for any reason before the final settlement of the office of the Chief Executive, both Houses in a joint session elect a new Governor by secret ballot. The House of Representatives is empowered by the Constitution to make the Governor responsible for his actions and, in extreme cases, to indict him. Law III., Art. 34, of 1848, provides for a supreme disciplinary Court composed of members of the Upper House authorized to exercise such a power over the Governor. The eligibility of members of this Court is decided by their jurisdictional and judicial knowledge and practice. The cabinet ministers can also be held responsible by the Court.

GOVERNMENT AND THE CABINET

The executive power of Hungary is exercised by a responsible Cabinet, composed of ten Cabinet Ministers appointed by the Regent of Hungary. The Cabinet portfolios are Premier, Justice, Foreign Affairs, Interior, Finances, Commerce, Agriculture, War, Worship, Public Instruction and Public Welfare. The constitutional Cabinet is responsible for every political action to the Parliament which represents the Hungarian people.

It is an old practice in Hungary that the Cabinet Ministers, as in Britain, shall also be members of the National Parliament. This is not founded on the Constitution, but has been a practice since the first Constitutional Cabinet of Kossuth in 1848. It does not mean that a man qualified for a portfolio is not and could not be chosen outside of Parliament. In such a case, he must seek election as a member of Parliament for the first vacant seat. Even the first

political assistants of the Cabinet Ministers are members of the House of Representatives. They are called State Secretaries, but are entirely different from the English or American Secretaries of State. These positions are controlled by the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Because the government is composed of members of the House of Representatives, and the Cabinet Ministers and State Secretaries are present in all sessions and sittings of the Legislature, the political life and constitutional duties of the government are greatly facilitated. The Cabinet Ministers prepare and present the new laws according to the requirements of the country. The members of Parliament are able to discuss political matters with the government in open sessions of Parliament. This has proved to be the best system of publicly controlling the political actions of the government through Parliament and is especially healthy and valuable if used by the Opposition. Hot debates often ensue in the open sessions between Representatives and Ministers. According to the Constitution, if a Cabinet Minister is voted down by a majority, he must immediately tender his resignation. On the other hand, governments usually control a majority in the House of Representatives, composed of members of the political party from which the members of the Cabinet are generally chosen. In case of a coalition Cabinet, the various political parties are represented in the Cabinet. To vote down a Cabinet Minister would require the majority party, which is generally well disciplined and firmly controlled by the leader of the party, usually the Premier. As long as the government is able to maintain the confidence of the house, it is stable, firm and can fulfill its duties unhindered. The cooperation of majority and minority in the House of Representatives creates the healthy blood circulation of a nation in which the opinions of all parties are respected.

THE COURTS

"True administration of justice is the firmest pillar of good government."

The Administration and the Judiciary System have been separate in Hungary since 1869. The courts are civil and criminal. The courts are of three instances, the District Courts; the Courts of Second Instance, called "*Tabla*"; and the highest Court, the "*Royal Curia*" in Budapest, which corresponds to the Supreme Court of the United States. The independence of all Judges and the absolute separation of the entire Judiciary System from the State Administration granted by the Constitution is the best guarantee for justice.

There are 138 Courts of the First Instance in Hungary and 24 of the Second Instance. In every Court the District Attorney is the public prosecutor. The Juvenile Courts, of which there are now 43 in session, are considered of great importance and have been in use from twelve to eighteen years. There are 1,073 Judges and 233 District Attorneys or public prosecutors. As to the lawyers, there are 13 bars with 5,682 members. The royal notary publics hold a responsible position in Hungary, which is generally the sources of a good income. They have 5 bars and 167 members.

All Judges are appointed for life by the King or Regent, but with their own consent can be removed from their places by the government. They advance gradually to higher judiciary positions, from which they cannot be removed by the government. After a number of years they can retire with the customary pension. Royal notaries are appointed by the King upon the suggestion of the government and must be either practicing lawyers or judges. This system, based on the Constitution, permits an absolutely impartial justice. It is known all over Europe as one of the best in existence.

For centuries the Hungarian Courts have brought in their judgments in the name of the King of Hungary as a symbol that the source of all justice comes from the Chief Executive of the country, who is considered the highest guardian of all rights and justice. But as Hungary, is also a Kingdom, which since 1921 has had no King, so that the exercise of some of the royal prerogatives is dormant for the time being, all judgments are now issued in the name of the nation as in the United States.

12. EDUCATION IN HUNGARY

A unique attitude is to be seen in the thousand-year-old history of the Hungarian nation. The Magyar race, wedged in between the Slavs of the Orient and the Germans of the West, and living in a territory which, because of its peculiar geographical situation, served partly as a natural bridge and partly as a natural battle-field between the cultured West and the uncivilized East, could survive only by defending itself simultaneously against the imperialism of the Western world and the onrushing barbarians of the East. The whole history of the Magyars is, in the last analysis, but an eternal struggle on two fronts against two enemies. This perpetual war, fought for the preservation of the race, was waged not only according to military and diplomatic methods, but also with spiritual weapons. In the many wars, which mark the road of the Hungarian nation from the dim past of its history up to the present day, the Magyars have fought for their political independence; but, at the same time, their very national and racial existence was threatened with extinction by the sweeping waves of the sea of Slavs and Germans. If the Hungarians did not wish to be absorbed either by the Slavs or by the Germans, they had to devise an efficient and far-reaching policy of culture and education that proceeded on a line parallel to the guiding principle of Hungarian politics. First, their position between the powers of East and West had to be maintained; second, their own language and culture had to be preserved, even in the midst of alien races. Thus the cultural and educational policy has always played an outstanding role in the history of the Hungarian nation. This policy, the last line of eternal self-defense, held a significant part in the war that was being constantly fought for the preservation of the race.

Politically and culturally the Hungarians have always been sympathetic with Western Europe. It was their historic mission to be the most Eastern outpost of West-European culture, and the defenders of Western civilization against the attacks of the East. The Hungarians have always regarded themselves as representatives of the West; they have been only too conscious of the fact that they have spent centuries defending the precious spiritual treasures of European culture against the hordes of the Tartars and Turks; their inherent longing for culture and civilization drew them towards the magic circle of Western civilization. At the same time, however, they were unwilling to give up their national and racial individuality and their national culture even for the sake of Western civilization. They wanted their national culture to develop with the help of Western civilization, but not to vanish in the more

complex 'Kultur' of their German neighbours. This is the explanation of the fact that the Magyars, while so assiduously asserting their own close connection with Western civilization, have fought and struggled vehemently for centuries in order to avoid a Germanization of their own culture. They, an Oriental race *par excellence,* dreaded the low cultural standard of the East and sought to belong to the West, yet not without maintaining their cultural as well as political independence.

This explains why the cultural and educational policy of Hungary has always been modelled after Western patterns and has developed in accordance with Western principles for ten centuries. The basis of the Hungarian cultural and educational policy was laid down by the first Hungarian King, St. Stephen; the greatest achievement of his reign was the establishment of spiritual contact between Hungary and the cultured West, represented in this case by the adoption of Christianity. The fact that he crushed heathenism, abolished the old pagan rites of the Magyars, and forced the Roman Catholic religion upon the people, was not the result of religious ardour, but was an act of high statesmanship. The ancient pagan religion represented the Orient; Catholicism, Western civilization. The Italian, German and other Western European missionaries brought in by Stephen were not only preachers of a new religion, but pioneers of Western progress.

With the passing of the centuries, the contact of Hungary with the culture and civilization of the Occident grew closer until the educational and cultural policy of the country was formulated according to the ruling educational ideals of Western Europe. Colleges and universities were established after Italian and German models while famous exponents of the sciences were invited to teach and lecture in these early homes of Hungarian culture and education.[1] Thus in the fifteenth century (1651) Comenius, the foremost Moravian scientist of his time, lectured at the College of Sárospatak, in Northern Hungary. The German professors Optiz and Bisterfield, and the English scientist Bazire, also taught in various Hungarian universities, while, at the same time, Hungarian men of science were received enthusiastically in Western universities. At the famous University of Wittenberg the Magyar

1 The Istropolis, an academy of higher learning in Pozsony was founded by King Matthias in 1543.

Johannes Hungarus was one of the teachers of Melancthon; in Konigsberg Valentinus Pannonius taught medicine; the University of Graz was the alma mater of the Hungarian theologists Stephen Szántó, George Forró, John Nagy, and Péter Pázmány, later the Primate of Hungary. The Italian universities, too, opened their doors to Hungarian scholars and in the fifteenth century Giovanni d'Ungheria and Dyonisio d'Ungheria lectured in Bologna and Professor Zsámboky taught mathematics at the University of Padua. Thus we see that culture and education attained a high standard in Hungary as early as the fifteenth century with Hungary forming an organic part of the general European culture. The highly developed civilization of Western Europe inspired the Hungarians in the direction of establishing culture and education similar in spirit and mentality to the examples set by Western neighbours.

Up to 1842, Latin was the language of instruction in all universities and colleges of Hungary; (only with the spread of the Reformation was the Magyar language used in the schoolrooms). On the European continent, general education was considered a luxury and the privilege of the upper and middle classes; this condition existed especially in Hungary, since devastating wars, revolutions, civil wars and the invasion of foreign powers greatly hindered the natural development of the country's educational system. For one hundred and fifty years a considerable part of the country was under Turkish occupation and the Turks sought purposely to prevent the activities of the colleges; later on, when the Habsburg favoured Catholic schools where the language of instruction was either Latin or German, the establishment of colleges supported by the Reformed Churches was discouraged since these colleges were regarded as hotbeds of Nationalist revolts. The Germanization of Hungary was one of the favourite experiments of the Habsburgs who suppressed to the best of their ability the use of the Hungarian language, as well as Hungarian education in the schools.

Thus general schooling and education in Hungary only started as late as the beginning of the nineteenth century; even in the early part of that century the great masses of the nation were excluded from the benefits of general education. The social and economic structure of the country was still based upon the institution of serfdom; the peasants, living in bondage, did not form an integral part of the nation, which consisted of the landed nobility and a rather thin stratum of burghers. There were not enough schools for children of the peasants and the well-intentioned plans of a group of patriots for the

introduction of elementary education on a broader basis were invariably wrecked, partly by the Vienna Government, and partly by the majority of the nobility, which regarded the education of the peasants as a direct way to rebellion. Though the revolution of 1848 sought to introduce drastic reforms, the collapse of the revolution resulted in a severe setback of Hungary's educational system, and the Hungarian language was banished again from all schools of the Country.

General public instruction and elementary education in the modern sense began only after the compromise between Austria and Hungary in the year 1867. A system of public schools was introduced and the cultural and educational policies were revised according to modern standards. The progress in education which this small nation was able to achieve within the short span of seventy years is little short of a miracle. If we keep in mind that the country's whole independent educational system is only sixty years old and that a~ far back as 1860, 58% of all inhabitants of the country were illiterate, we cannot fail to see the rapid development in the field of general education. The number of illiterates decreased during the period from 1910 to 1920 from 33.3% to 15.2%, which permits us to hope that within the very near future the percentage of illiterate people may be lowered to an insignificant fraction.

The educational system of pre-war Hungary was built upon principles identical to those which constituted the foundations of every other educational system in the modern States of Western Europe. This system proved so sound and efficient that it remained in force without any substantial change even after the war. The backbone of the educational system in Hungary is a network of elementary schools throughout the country; elementary schooling is compulsory and parents not sending their children to school are liable to severe punishment. Instruction is free. The elementary schools are only in part supported by the State; many schools are maintained by the communities and by the Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Reformed and Jewish Churches. The number of confessional schools may be accounted for by the fact that the Roman Catholic Church, having been in the past the mother of education, offered competition in educational matters to the new sects that developed after the Reformation.

In the elementary schools the period of instruction covers a period of six years; The High Schools offer an eight-year course to boys and girls, who, after

completing the work and passing the "Matura," a rigorous final examination, are eligible for entrance into one of the colleges or universities. In all High Schools the teaching of foreign languages is compulsory. In the Gymnasium High Schools, where pupils are taught Latin and Greek, German is compulsory, while in the ordinary High Schools greater emphasis is laid upon the teaching of modern languages, among them English and nature study courses.

Pre-war Hungary had a great number of colleges and universities. The role that these institutions played in the spiritual life of the country was considered so important that post-war Hungary, though cruelly dismembered by the Treaty of Trianon, not only continued to support those within her own territory but saved those situated in the lost territories by transferring them to other cities. Thus the famous University of Kolozsvár (today called Cluj by the Rumanians) was transferred to the City of Szeged. The ancient University of Pozsony, after the Treaty of Trianon allotted the city to the Czechs, continues its existence at Pécs.

The University of Budapest, which was founded by P. Pázmány, -1635, is the greatest and most famous university in Hungary, with an extensive student body and distinguished faculties. Somewhat smaller in size but not in importance is the University of Debrecen. In Hungary there are also various colleges for law, forestry and mining, and a well-organized Technical University in Budapest which trains students in the fields of engineering, chemistry, architecture and economics.

An important problem of educational policy was, in pre-war Hungary, the question of schools for the national minorities. Despite the fact that Hungarian Governments dealt with this problem in a liberal manner, attacks were launched against the educational system on the ground that the national minorities were opposed and deprived of opportunity to pursue their studies in their native tongue. For more than a decade preceding the World War, alleged exposures of Hungarian intolerance were published in various newspapers of Europe. The chief argument in these accusations was a claim that the Hungarians had tried forcibly to Magyarize the national minorities by withholding from them the right of educating their children according to methods and standards that might be adopted by each separate minority. Today we know that these accusations were the result of well-paid and well-executed propaganda for the purpose of provoking a hostile sentiment

against the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and undermining the internal peace of the Hungarian State.

In the following I do not wish to defend the policies of pre-war Hungarian Governments, nor do I intend to pass a judgment concerning the truth or falsity of the accusations raised against this educational policy of pre-war Hungary. I simply wish to present bare facts and dry figures which are adequate to illustrate the substance and the tendency of the Hungarian educational policy towards the national minorities.

According to the School Bill, passed by the Parliament, in 1868, every nationality living within the borders of the Hungarian state, was allowed to maintain its own schools. It was understood that general instruction was to be presented in these minority schools in the native idiom of each particular nationality. That the Hungarian language must also be taught was the only stipulation made by the law. Scarcely could this demand be called unreasonable nor the restriction severe. The United States is a country liberal in its consideration of citizens of foreign descent; but not one of the many nationalities living within its borders would dare to propose to establish schools where the English language would not be taught and practiced. How far the Hungarian Government had gone in granting full rights to the nationalities in this matter of schools and elementary education, can be shown by the fact that the Government subsidized thousands of minority schools from State funds, and thus made possible the erection of school buildings, the engagement and payment of teachers and the improvement of the general standard of education. In 1913 there were 447 German, 377 Slovak, 2,233 Rumanian, 270 Serbian, and 59 Ruthenian Carpatho-Russian schools in Hungary, many of which received financial support from Hungarian State funds. There were not included in these statistics the schools of Croatia and Slavonia, which, being under an autonomous administration, were not obliged to teach Hungarian. There were altogether 3,186 non-Magyar schools in Hungary, this figure representing one-fifth of all elementary schools of the country. Out of the 30,000 school teachers S,327 were non-Magyars. Among the High School teachers there were 244 who belonged to the German minority, 8 Slovaks, 143 Rumanians, and 80 of non-Magyar nationality, 39 of whom spoke an imperfect Hungarian and 21 of whom were unable to understand the Hungarian language.

This was the state of affairs in regard to the nationality schools of Hungary; this was the so-loudly-denounced "oppression of the nationalities" in the schools; this was the bitterly attacked "intolerance" towards the national minorities.

How different is the attitude of the Succession States towards their own Hungarian minorities! How differently are these minorities treated by the "oppressed" of yesterday in regard to educational matters! The Rumanian Government would not think of supporting non-Rumanian schools and its spirit of intolerance manifests itself in the cruel beatings administered to Hungarian students with the silent approval of Government officials. The Czecho-Slovakian Government is illiberal towards the Slovaks and Ruthenians as well; it tries to extinguish not only the Hungarian, but even the Slovak and Ruthenian language and culture. This injustice provoked a protest in the London *Times* which remarked in a recent editorial that "these people were far happier under the Hungarian rule than they are under the present rule of the Prague Government . . . the Slovaks, Ruthenians and Hungarians fighting together against their Czech oppressor . . ."Post-war Hungary has no nationality problems and its educational policy is confronted with tasks different from those of ten years ago. The problems, however, with which the new educational policy of Hungary has to deal, are neither less important nor simpler to solve. The country is poorer financially than before the Treaty of Trianon, and its citizens are groaning under the heavy burden of taxes and levies necessary to carry out the stipulations of the peace treaty. And yet, it is necessary for this smaller and poorer Hungary to face a greater expenditure of money for educational and cultural purposes than any with which the Greater Hungary had been confronted. While the successive Hungarian governments had spent 39,894,000 Pengö for purposes of elementary education during 47 years, the government of Count Stephen Bethlen spent for the same purpose 24,708,000 Pengö in five years. The number of teachers has been increased by 2000 during the past seven years, which means that post-war Hungary, with a territory two-thirds smaller, has as many teachers as the pre-war Hungary had. The educational program of the Government provides for the erection of 3,500 new school buildings, 1,700 new homes for teachers, and energetic reforms in the direction of raising the standard of general education. Within the next three years 90 new High Schools will be built so that every community with 5,000 inhabitants will have at least one High School.

The motives which prompted the government to devise an educational program on such a grand scale and to spend millions of dollars for educational purposes in spite of the grave financial situation of the country, are not merely of a cultural nature. As the case has been in the past, so now the educational and cultural policy of the Government serves higher aims of national politics and remains the axis and backbone of the general structure of the Hungarian governmental system. Introducing and putting through in a speedy course the great program of a popular system of liberal education serves not alone the policy of education but prepares the people also for political democracy—because a cultured democracy alone is the true and popular education for the people to conceive and digest political democracy. In the past the educational policy had sustained the progress of the race; in the present it strives to emphasize the cultural superiority of Hungary over those neighbouring countries which were so strangely favoured by the Treaty of Trianon. The dismemberment of the Hungarian State, the allotment of large parts of the thousand-year-old unit to neighbours inferior in culture has well-nigh "Balkanized" Central Europe. Hungary, however, though suffering poverty, weakness, and the loss of two-thirds of her territory and millions of her citizens, does not propose to be lowered to the cultural level of her neighbours. She dreads the Balkanization of her own ancient culture and proceeds with a fierce determination to preserve and even to accelerate the pace of her cultural development in spite of discouraging difficulties. The educational program of the Bethlen Government reaches far in its eager effort for new colleges for the teaching of English, Italian, French and German languages and literatures by competent professors. Here again we see the traditional tendency of the Hungarian cultural and educational policy:—the eternal attempt to belong to the cultured nations of the West by striking a sharp dividing line between Hungary and the uncivilized East. How deeply this longing for Western culture broods in the Hungarian soul, how ardently persists the desire to blend the country's cultural aspirations with those of the Western world!

In modern Hungary intensive scientific life began at a later date. Though art and literature flourished in the first half of the nineteenth century, the scientific activities of the nation were less considerable. It was not until the last decade of the century that scientific life was able to keep pace with general cultural development. The reason for this phenomenon can be found in the tragic political conditions prevailing in Hungary during the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century. External and internal wars prevented

Hungary from becoming absorbed in scientific activities; the perpetual struggle for national existence concentrated the best brains of the nation upon the vital political problems with which the country was confronted. While this immense struggle presented a stimulant to the development of literature and poetry, it acted as a narcotic to scientific interests. "When, at last, the Compromise of 1867 with Austria established the foundations of a peaceful and untroubled cultural development, scientific activity in Hungary centred about subjects of national interest. Hungarian science had to account for lost time, and a mass of raw material relative to the Hungarian language and history had to be arranged and analyzed. Thus it was necessary to lay a cornerstone for the building of Hungarian history, ethnography and folklore. In these fields Hungarian scientists have produced works of value, which, however, failed to attract the attention of the international scientific world since the particular nature of the subjects was essentially localized.

There were among the others two outstanding Hungarian scientists and explorers who have achieved international fame. Both set out to establish the origin of the Hungarian race, and both undertook extensive travels to Asia to explore parts of that continent hitherto inaccessible to Europeans. One of them, Alexander Körösi-Csoma, a colourful and pathetic figure, was the first to explore Tibet and to edit a valuable dictionary of the Tibetan language, which was the tangible result of his seven years of long study in the seclusion of a Tibetan cloister. On his grave at Darjeeling, at the southern entrance of the Himalaya mountains, a monument erected by the Royal British Geographical Society preserves the memory of the Hungarian explorer—a memory so vividly living among Tibetans that the Lamas still in present days arrange pilgrimages to the grave of their "Great White Friend." As the founder of the Science of Tibetan Philology and of the Science of Tibetan Buddhism, he is recognized as one of the classicists of Orientalism. The second was Armin Vámbéry, later Professor of the University of Oxford in England, who travelled in the garb of a Dervish through Asia Minor, Arabia and Kurdistan. After these trips he published an account of his experiences, which are the foundations of our knowledge regarding the races of these countries. The English Government lavished honours and decorations on the little, limping Hungarian explorer. Often his advice was sought by those who carried out the English foreign policy toward the problems of the Near East. He was the friend of Queen Victoria and Edward VII.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century when the government gave more generous support to scientific research work, scientific study received a new impetus and Hungarian scientists began to turn their attention to subjects of international character and importance. Scientific institutions for the study of Astronomy, Meteorology, Seismology, Geography, Archeology, Biology, Botany, Statistics and Agricultural Experiments were founded and the results of work accomplished in these institutions had a profound effect upon the development of Hungarian scientific life. Soon the published works of Hungarian scientists attracted the attention of scholars and scientists all over the world. In Physics the experiments of Baron Roland Eötvös were hailed as accomplishments of extraordinary importance; in the field of Egyptology Dr. Gustav Mahler achieved significant results; the works of Dr. Ignaz Goldzieher, one of the foremost orientalists of the world, marked a new chapter in the field of this particular science; and, to mention a representative of the younger generation, Dr. Leopold Fejér, whose mathematical research work appeared so important to Henry Poincaré, the greatest mathematician of our century, that he invited the young man to Paris. Here, Dr. Fejér continued his studies and important scientific discoveries in the field of mathematics followed his extensive work.

In no field of scientific life, however, have the Hungarians achieved such valuable results as in the various branches of medicine. Medical science in Hungary has risen to a level of distinguished height. The famous Professor Ignaz Semmelweiss was one of the pioneers in modern gynecology, and Baron Alexander Korányi in kidney research. Professor Emil Grosz opened new vistas before the ophthalmologists of the world.

Modern Hungarian scientific life is centered partly in the universities and the scientific institutions, and partly in the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The latter institution, one of the most important of its kind on the continent, was founded in 1825 under singular circumstances. After various attempts to support the erection of a scientific centre in Hungary, the question was brought before the Parliament in Pozsony. All the speakers agreed that nothing could be done in the matter, because of the lack of necessary funds. At this junction a young aristocrat, Count Stephen Széchényi, stood up and offered 60,000 gold forints for the purpose. The sum represented a year's income to the young magnate. His example was instantly followed by other members of the Parliament. Soon afterward the Hungarian Academy of Sciences came into being[2]. Today it is housed in a magnificent palace of its

own in the capital of Hungary and with its wide influence it is an important lever of Hungarian scientific activities. The aim of this institution is to develop and to protect Hungarian Science and literature and even any foreign science that is in some way connected with Hungary. It is well organized and divided into several departments, which carry on important research work. The Academy supports several monthly publications, each of which is influential from the point of view of scientific research. Apart from that, it publishes books of scientific importance, thus enabling scholars and scientists to bring the results of their works before the scientific world. The Academy also has various foundations, the most important of them being the Roman History Institute and the "Goethe Rooms" containing the collection of references to work of the great German writer. The Academy Prize of $2,000 goes every year to the scientist whose achievements were the most outstanding during the preceding year. This prize, being available for foreign scientists, as well, has been awarded in several cases to prominent scholars and scientists of foreign countries.

Besides the Academy, there are 55 scientific and literary institutions in Hungary, the most important of which is "The Hungarian Federation of Scientific Societies and Institutions in Budapest." Its aim is to help and to protect all scientific and cultural institutions within and without Hungary.

An interesting and characteristic feature of Hungarian scientific life is the desire of the Magyar scholars to form a close connection with the Western scientific world even at the Cost of financial sacrifice. It is the same tendency which runs through the entire cultural history of the Hungarians, the innate desire to be a part of the West and to demonstrate before the whole world the wholly Western character of Hungarian cultural life. There are Hungarian scientific institutions all over the world, scientific centres with the double purpose of bringing foreign students in contact with Hungary and its culture, and enabling Hungarian students to continue their studies in foreign countries. One of the most important Hungarian scientific institutions abroad is the Hungarian Institution of the Berlin University, with a

2 In 1832 the Academy established its first international scientific cooperative program with the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia. [Ed.]

magnificent library and every other possible facility for foreign students of the Hungarian language and literature. There is also a chair for Hungarian language and literature at the University of Vienna. There are five Hungarian Institutes—in Stockholm, Reval, Sofia, Madrid, Dorpat, respectively. Hungarian Institutes were lately established in Rome and in Palarro Falconieri. A move has been made recently in Paris to fill again the Hungarian chair at the Sorbonne. Hungarian Institutions have lately been founded in Geneva and in Helsingfors, thus enlarging the chain of Hungarian scientific institutions in foreign countries. All these institutions are closely connected with one another and are organized in the "Federation of Hungarian Institutions in Foreign Countries." It is natural that the Hungarian Government makes every effort to subsidize these foreign scientific centres and to help their work.

Recently scientific and cultural relations have been established between Hungary and America by the awarding of scholarships and in the exchange of students. Thus the Institute of International Education in New York—a Carnegie Foundation—created an important bond in establishing closer cultural relations with Hungary by the exchange of students of both sexes. Scholarships of $800 to $1000 have also been awarded by Harvard and Columbia Universities and the colleges of Vassar, Radcliffe, Smith, Mount Holyoke, Wellesley, etc.

This close contact of the Hungarian scientific life with the international world of science manifests itself in phenomena other than the establishment of Hungarian institutions in foreign countries. All over the world, in every branch of scientific activity we find Hungarian scholars and scientists working and lecturing in foreign scientific centres. We find them in the laboratories, at the lecturing desks of famous universities, and among the foremost physicians in almost every European capital. Hungary, which has been the native home of artists and writers, has recently become the birthplace of distinguished men of science. The reason for this increased migration of Hungarian scientists may be found in the fact that the Hungarian field for practical work has become too small in consequence of the loss of vast territories, while, at the same time, the graduation of brilliant young scholars and scientists from Hungarian universities remains the same as before the war. Those scientists and scholars who had previously lived in the lost territories, were forced to emigrate partly because of racial persecution, and partly because the conditions introduced by the new regimes were utterly unfavourable to any

kind of scientific work. The fact itself that Hungary has so great a surplus in scholars and scientists, tends to show the intensity of scientific life in Hungary and the high standard of scientific education in that country. It also indicates that in spite of defeat in war, Hungary has succeeded in maintaining a cultural level superior to that of the newly created neighbours in the ever-broadening field of education and scientific discovery.

Hungary of today [1934] is very much in sympathy with the educational policy of the United States of America and has already introduced the exchange of Hungarian and American students, with the assistance of the Institute of International Education of the Carnegie Foundation in New York. Among the various fellowships of that splendid Institution we see, already officially listed, the American Hungarian Student Exchange, bringing the two countries spiritually nearer, through "reciprocity" in the higher learning.

The Educational Policy of post-war Hungary has advanced a great deal. The present Secretary of Education, Dr. Bálint Hóman, and the two under-Secretaries of State, Dr. Paul Petri and Dr. Julius Kornis, are all men of modern spirit and cultural progress. The two latter visited the United States recently and imbibed much of the American spirit, especially in the emphasis laid upon the practical education, for the practical life of American citizenship.

Freedom of action is a second educational policy in Hungarian schools. The spirit of initiative (to create) and the spirit of leadership are the great moral and ethical foundations of the civilization of the United States, which were initiated also in many parts of old Europe, and particularly in Hungarian educational policy.

A very important standard in the new educational policy of Hungary is the teaching of the civic rights and duties in the High Schools, with the object of training the youth of Hungary to the true integrity of citizenship.

But while in America great philanthropists like Rockefeller, Carnegie and many others, and boards of trustees in Universities (boards composed of men of great wealth, once students of that Alma Mater) are generous supporters of education, in Hungary rich men rarely leave their fortunes to general

education. The schools, especially those of higher education, depend entirely upon the State.

13. HUNGARIAN ART AND LITERATURE

If a modern disciple of Malthus should conceive the whimsical idea of making a statistical survey of the artistic and literary productions of the large cities of the world, Budapest, if not actually heading the list, would at least rank among the foremost. Where-ever one turns one's eyes, whatever field of literary or artistic activity one chooses to examine, there one finds the names of Hungarian artists among the leaders of their respective fields. It is as if the Hungarian capital, realizing the character of this highly specialized age in which we live, had selected for its specialty the production of talented men of arts and letters.

As Paris is the fashion centre of the world, as Nüremberg floods the markets with dolls and toys, as Brussels produces laces, Hollywood moving pictures, Detroit automobiles, Pittsburgh steel, and Vienna music, so Budapest fosters artists and writers. It is a city of gifted men; a city which has sent forth a procession of artistic leaders. It has created a new trademark, so to speak, in the international market of arts: "Made in Budapest" is now a well-known slogan in the realm of culture.

As through the great Russian novelists the world became acquainted with the "white lights" of St. Petersburg and the crowded quarters of misery in Moscow, so the public has come to know Budapest life through the works of the Hungarian musicians, artists and playwrights who have made a successful entry upon the international stage.

A glance at the musical page of any newspaper of any great city of the world will reveal at least a dozen Hungarian names among the well-known artists of the concert halls. A similar survey will show that the same condition exists in allied branches of culture. Groups of composers from Franz Lehár to Ernest Dohnányi, from Imre Kálmán to Béla Bartók, have given the world a taste of the sweet, passionate music in which the very soul of Hungary lives.

Among the distinguished painters one will find such Hungarian names as Michael Munkácsy and Philipp de László. And if one is willing to take into account the "*dii minorum gentium*," the list of Hungarian painters and caricaturists working beyond the borders of Hungary will include not dozens

but hundreds of names. This small land has, in fact, produced so many talented workers of an artistic bent that every year hundreds are "exported" from their native country. This phenomenon of a small country producing such a surplus of artists and writers is the more unusual because the vast majority of Hungary's population consists of peasants who are utterly without interest in any kind of art, and because the per capita wealth even among the more cultured classes is very much smaller than in the nations of Western Europe.

Art and literature usually develop in countries that have reached a high level of prosperity. In the case of Hungary, however, we have an exception. It is a poor nation, whose population struggles hard for daily existence; an agricultural country where the provinces respond but faintly to the artistic and literary aspirations of the capital. For the most part Hungarian art is fostered and marketed in Budapest, while the provinces provide the picturesque background and frequently the subject matter for the artists.

Whence comes this endless stream of artists that the Hungarian capital is producing *en masse?* What then is the secret of this comparatively enormous production and even over-production? Does it lie in the nature of the race or has it some secret roots in the buried cultures of past centuries? Or is it merely the result of many strange coincidences, a caprice of history, a development not to be explained by the usual methods of historical research? In the development of Hungarian culture it is difficult to find an explanation of the sudden and inspired awakening of artistic talent.

The humanities flourished in Hungary during past periods of history, but seldom reached the level existing throughout Western Europe. The geographic position of the country, the course of historical events, the constant wars and political struggles for existence, were unfavourable to an untroubled cultural evolution in the early centuries. The influence of Western civilization was also too strong to permit the independent development of an Hungarian style *par excellence* or a characteristically Magyar school of painting.

During the reign of the Anjou dynasty and that of Matthias Corvinus, a host of painters came to Hungary at the invitation of the Magyar Renaissance kings. They left a number of noteworthy works, but their activity failed to stimulate native art. We have the works of John Aquilla, a Hungarian

Renaissance painter; and the miniatures of John Rozsnyai, but the artistic production was so insignificant that no other great names appeared until the 17th Century when two interesting and rather important painters achieved fame. But these artists, Nicholas Kupeczky and Ádám Mányoki, spent the greater part of their lives in other countries.

The builders of churches were German or Italian architects whose work expressed the dominating trend of the century. There are four or five excellent examples of 13th Century Romanesque and 15th Century Gothic Renaissance architecture among the ancient churches of Hungary. But these probably were designed by foreign artists, or if they were built by Hungarian masters, the names of these have been lost in the mists of oblivion.

In spite of the seemingly small artistic output of Hungary during the first seven centuries of its history, a number of beautiful architectural and sculptural works still stand as monuments to the culture of that period. The architecture of the Renaissance has a particular branch known as Hungarian Renaissance, which manifested itself in Hungary in finely-built palazzos and dignified chateaux; later the baroque and rococo styles left their mark on Hungarian architecture, the former having found an excellent expression in the splendid chateau of Esterházy.

The same political and social conditions which partly paralyzed Hungarian plastic arts, also held back the development of a national literature. During the early centuries the Church tried to suppress the probably somewhat "immoral" folk songs of the Magyars. The Hungarian language was regarded as the language of serfs and peasants, the ruling classes speaking Latin. During the time when Italy had her Dante, the Hungarians composed only one piece of "literature," a funeral oration written in the native tongue. In the 16th and 17th Centuries, when England produced Shakespeare and France Moliere, the Hungarian tongue was still too crude and unpolished to be a possible medium of artistic expression. The literary works of these centuries, for the most part naïve and primitive, are of interest to the historians alone. The Protestant penetration of the country brought with it a renaissance of the Hungarian language and the long resistance to Habsburg oppression inspired beautiful examples of patriotic poetry. But these were isolated phenomena and had no literary continuity and no lasting effect upon literature.

We cannot really speak of a sustained artistic life in Hungary until the first half of the 19th Century, when national life began to awaken and the more rapid spread of national culture commenced to bring forth fruits.

Through the efforts of Ferenc Kazinczy, a writer with more enthusiasm than talent, who recognized the necessity for refining the language as a prerequisite to literary activity, the national idiom lost much of its archaic clumsiness and became a more suitable vehicle for literary expression. The first real poets and men of letters were confronted with well-nigh insurmountable difficulties in finding their way to the small and rather backward public which was either too ignorant to appreciate their writings or quite devoid of literary taste. Though these pioneers laid the foundations of an independent Hungarian literature and literary life, their works lacked originality and frequently were fashioned after German, French and Latin models. They were too intent on arousing the nation from its cultural stupor to create a literature for literature's sake. Theirs was the lot of the pioneers who prepare the ground in order that a later generation may harvest.

The next generation produced the classicists, who lived and worked in the golden era of Hungarian literature. Three prominent figures, Michael Vörösmarty, Alexander Petöfi and John Arany, stand out. The first of these had less originality than the others, and was still too much under the influence of foreign classics; his epics were of a beauty too cold and formal, his tragedies too closely followed Shakespearian dramatic models, without attaining the natural vital force of the English immortal. Yet many of his lyric poems reflect his fascinating genius and will die only with the death of the Hungarian language.

Above all, this poet who had the misfortune of writing to a rather primitive public, employed a language of almost unsurpassable beauty. It was he who moulded the Magyar language to a fine perfection and showed that it was an excellent medium for the metric-classical form of poetry as well as for modern forms. While Vörösmarty established Hungarian forms of poetry, it was Arany and Petöfi who brought them to the highest point of excellence. Arany, a master of the language, followed in the footsteps of Vörösmarty and wrote epopées which differed, however, from those of his predecessor. He revived the original Alexandrian form and treated it with such artistry, force and originality that he seemed to have created a new form of poetic expression. He

was the first Hungarian who rightfully could be ranked among the leading poets of Western Europe.

The greatest of this triumvirate was Petöfi, the Robert Burns of the Hungarians, the foremost national poet of the Magyar race. A wild and tempestuous genius, this man inflamed the imagination of his compatriots. His poems which sang of liberty, world freedom, love and hatred, were full of passion and imagination, but retained withal the simplicity of folk-songs. There is no illiterate peasant in Hungary who does not know three or four of Petöfi's poems, no child who would not know his name. He was one of the most colourful figures of the national revolution of 1848 and one of the first to take up arms against Austrian oppression. He became the inspired singer of the volunteer army, whose "talpra Magyar" was the Marseillaise of the revolution. He died at the age of 27, defending his ideas of liberty and was buried in a mass grave somewhere on the battlefield. His resting place is unknown and decades after his death there was still a legend among the simple peasants to the effect that Petöfi had not died in battle but was living somewhere in Europe hiding from the Austrians and waiting for a new national resurrection.

The first and greatest Hungarian novelist, Maurice Jókai, was a contemporary of these men. He was the first writer who broke the barriers of his country's literary isolation and whose works found their way into foreign lands. His novels are still read, and the decades which have passed since his death have not lessened their international popularity. At the time of their appearance they were considered ultra-modern; but they were the first literary products in Hungary that could be published without the risk of a financial loss.

This era of artistic and literary revival, however, came to an abrupt conclusion after the collapse of the revolution. A dark period of oppression, persecution and imprisonment followed. Severe censorship wrought havoc with the works of Hungarian poets and Writers, theatrical performances in the Magyar tongue were prohibited, the leaders of the nation were banished and the Hungarian schools were closed. Under such circumstances cultural life could not thrive. 'While the oppression steeled the nation's will to achieve an independent life, its budding literature was bound to lapse from the level earlier attained. Two decades later, when the treaty with Austria guaranteed the cultural rights of the Magyars, literature was freed from censorship but men were lacking to inspire it with new life and vigour. The revival of art was

necessarily gradual. However, theatres were established, newspapers with quickly growing circulations were founded, and literary circles and societies began to stimulate writers to effort and activity. Cultural life was gaining strength but the country was poor, backward, and lacking in the foundations and traditions necessary for a rich literary and artistic life. Few people were able or willing to spend money on books and objects of art. Artists were forced to go abroad in quest of financial return for their work. Thus the prominent painters of this period spent more time in foreign lands than in Hungary, despite their Magyar heritage and sympathies and the essentially Hungarian style of their art.

Michael Munkácsy, more of whose paintings may be found in the United States than in his native land (his famous Milton adorns the New York Public Library and his greatest creation, "Christ before Pilate," is in the Wanamaker collection in Philadelphia), spent the greater part of his life in Paris. Here among people whose language he never mastered perfectly, in a land foreign even to the substance of his art, this artist lived, painting genre pictures with typically Hungarian subjects for his inspiration. Count Michael Zichy, whose drawings achieved world fame, lived in St. Petersburg; Piloty in Munich; and Julius Benczur, the Magyar portrait painter, also made his home in Germany.

To understand the extraordinary suddenness of the artistic and literary revival in Hungary one must visualize the conditions that prevailed twenty-odd years ago. Budapest was already a spirited city with many newspapers, theatres, literary clubs and societies for artists, but it still retained a provincial tone, and could be likened to a growing boy who had not yet discovered his personality or his power.

The giant figures of the classical period were dead, and the works of their few disciples, such men as Francis Herczeg, Eugen Rákosi, Kálmán Mikszáth, Albert Berzeviczy, Joseph Kiss and Andor Kozma, were frequently only faint copies of the masterpieces of their distinguished predecessors. In spite of the number of artists and writers who frequented the clubs and coffee-houses, art and literature appeared dormant, and had it not been for the watchful nursing of the Royal Academy and similar institutions they would have disappeared entirely. The public read books in the Hungarian tongue but these were mostly translations from well-known foreign authors; it patronized the theatres but looked coldly on the more or less primitive attempts of the Hungarian playwrights. To embark upon a literary career at this time meant

certain starvation and the two or three authors who succeeded in winning the public's favour were forced to depend on other work to earn their livelihood. To find a publisher for a manuscript was a bold and frequently hopeless adventure and even in the case of success it was at best an unprofitable one.

At this juncture a new generation appeared on the scene and the "Sturm und Drang" period of the new Hungarian literature commenced. The exponents of this new phase were unknown and shockingly impolite young men who were wont to rise at three o'clock in the afternoon and spend their lives in the various coffee-houses where in the heat of debate they often neglected the formality of paying their checks. Aping the example of Théophile Gautier, they shocked the bourgeoisie with their long hair and velvet jackets. These young gentlemen did not storm the gates of the Academy or the aristocratic circle of recognized writers, or even the managerial offices of established theatres; instead they beguiled their working hours in poorly-paid positions on the staffs of the smaller newspapers. Their social backgrounds were unknown, some of them coming from the miserable quarters of the city, some from the provinces; but they soon attracted attention by their brilliance in journalism. Those of the smaller newspapers that had unwittingly hired these gauche young men soon began to gain prominence. The public took a keener interest in the humourous column from the pen of a youth named Molnár than it did in the mature comments of respectable and learned editorial writers on the conservative papers. Because the literary and artistic convictions of the Hungarian publishers were directed largely by their financial interests, they yielded to public taste and gave the moderns writing positions of importance. Budapest thereafter soon boasted a press where every editor was a dramatist and every reporter a novelist or short story writer. Thus the Fleet Street of the Hungarian capital presented an army of brilliant writers who were determined to combat everything old-fashioned or "uninspired." The now sympathetic newspapers aided the publication of novels, and the public, though still merciless in its criticism, bought and read. Homage was paid here to Strindberg, Kipling, Ibsen, Wilde and Verlaine by the introduction of the works of these foreign iconoclasts to Budapest.

The young Hungarian revolutionaries spent several months each year in Paris and Berlin, studying the naturalistic theatre, and soon went so far as to declare that they were able to write better plays than many of the old-fashioned playwrights who considered it their patriotic duty to write one drama each

year which would be produced in the National Theatre and which would sometimes reach the high mark of five consecutive performances.

The leader of this literary revolt was Alexander Bródy, a restless, moody man who was given to writing his works on the marble tops of the tables in the coffee-houses. His writings frequently suffered from hurried workmanship but were nevertheless brilliant and fresh in their point of view. In the ranks of these moderns appeared Andreas Ady, one of the outstanding poets of the 20th Century, a second Petöfi, about whom this younger generation rallied. This poet was the Walt Whitman of Hungary. His forceful poems were puzzling in their modernity and, although attacked and ridiculed by the conservatives, could not be ignored. Blood and gold was the refrain of his works, the song of blood and the song of clinging gold. Ady's name soon became the rallying cry of the liberals and their banner was planted quickly on the most important breastworks of the literary battlefield.

Although the theatres were at first reluctant to open their doors to this new generation, the first plays of Ferenc Molnár and Melchior Lengyel met with unparalleled success. Molnár, already acknowledged an artist of rare talent, became a world figure upon the production of his play "The Devil." The first play by Lengyel, "Typhoon" also scored an immediate success. Thus encouraged, other young authors turned their interests to play-writing, with the result that whereas in 1902 the greatest feat of the Comedy Theatre was to arrange "one hundred consecutive Hungarian nights." In 1912 it presented exclusively Hungarian plays.

Thus the battle was won by the new school of writers. A poem by Ady became more significant than the speech of a Cabinet Minister. New reviews and literary magazines were founded, and with the rapid spread of modern literature other fields of art began to show new life. Hungarian painting went through a period of rejuvenation; it became the fashionable thing to be present at the "*vernissage,*" the opening of an exhibition; and the well-situated middle-class acquired the habit of buying pictures. With this response, the number of first-class artists grew with amazing rapidity. In this period Paul Szinnyey-Merse was a leader of the modern "plain air" school, around whom men like Pentelei-Molnár, Mednyánszky, Rippl-Ronai, Csók and others were grouped. Composers and conductors fell in with the general march toward an artistic Renaissance, and within a few years Hungary changed from an art-importing to an art-exporting country. Budapest, where all this activity

was centralized, was launched in its role of an art-nourishing capital. It had, indeed, a unique atmosphere for developing dormant abilities in its romantically inclined men and women. There was created, in effect, a hot-house where artistic abilities developed freely.

"The world of arts and letters" is more than a phrase in Budapest. It is a reality. There exists a special, rigidly enclosed world of authors and artists which has nothing to do with the bourgeoisie and which ignores the business world. The struggling newspaper man who has caught attention with a novel or the actor who has made an impression in a small part, becomes automatically a member of this world, where only ability secures the right of admission and where money cannot buy membership. This exclusive world has its own code, its factions, its parties, its leaders and arbiters, its tragedies and romances. It is less Bohemian than the Latin Quarter or the Montmartre of Paris and more aristocratic than Greenwich Village of New York.

Three o'clock in the afternoon begins the day in one of the literary coffee-houses where the enrolled members of this world of arts and letters have the prerogatives of reserved tables, a bill of fare with special prices and the right of paying their checks "later." Molnár appears at the large marble-topped table in the Café New York, where the "arrives" of journalism and literature assemble, and there engages in heated debate with the novelist, Frederic Karinthy, or the playwright, Eugene Heltay. Every group has its headquarters in one of the coffee-houses, the painters in the Café Japan, the musicians in the Opera Café, and other writers in the Café Abbazia. Those who find noon too early an hour to arise, appear in the "Otthon Club" at five o'clock while the dinner hour finds all in the luxurious "Nest Club," where hundreds of artists and writers appear every night.

In this uncommercialized and fantastic world, success does not mean financial reward. There are dozens of literary lights in Budapest who are failures from a strictly financial point of view, but nevertheless they have a higher standing in their own world than many of those who have achieved greater fame and more money. The poet, Michael Babits, the novelist Béla Révész, the short story writer, Frederic Karinthy, the poet Ernö Szép, the novelist and essayist Zoltán Ambrus, the author of peasant dramas, Zsigmond Móricz—these men have never been regarded as worldly successes but they are acknowledged as men of great talent and their views carry greater weight in their world than the opinions of the "clever manufacturer of plays" or of an author of "best sellers."

There are a few artists and writers who keep aloof from this circle and live either in the provinces or in isolation in Budapest. They shun the strain of public appearances, preferring to work in the tranquillity of their studios, but they represent a small fraction of the great number of Hungarian artists. The spell cast by this environment upon its devotees is so great that they feel the necessity of returning to it even after they have established themselves in high positions elsewhere. For example, Imre Kálmán, a successful composer of musical comedies, lives in Vienna and has an estate in the Austrian Alps, but he returns periodically to his native Hungary to enjoy again the companionship of Budapest's men of letters.

The fact that the Budapest artists and literati have created this environment cannot alone account for the numbers engaged in artistic pursuits. Talent and creative force are what the Hungarians seem to have in abundance. It is, perhaps, a native ability of the Magyars, who inherited the love of the arts from their Asiatic ancestors. It might also have something to do with the wealth of the Hungarian's Oriental fantasy. He is not a money-maker. He likes to enjoy life, to play with fantastic ideas, to debate questions of art and literature, to walk lazily along the quays of the Danube relishing the colours of a summer sunset. The brain of the Budapester is saturated from his early youth with art and it is his highest ambition to become an artist.

This is the explanation of the fact that, even now, when Hungary has lost two-thirds of her territory, when her neighbours use force in excluding every work of Hungarian art and literature, when the smaller Hungary is unable to support even authors and artists with established names, that Hungarian artistic and literary production does not stop. It keeps its strength and brilliance, the only weapon in the hand of this small nation to demonstrate its right to live and to maintain its place in the sun.

14. ECONOMICS AND FINANCE IN POST-WAR HUNGARY

Ever since the War, Hungary has had an excess of imports over exports. However, both imports and exports have increased greatly during the last few years.

An analysis of the foreign trade of Hungary shows that the countries which supply the majority of her imports are Austria, Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania, Italy, Poland, Yugo-Slavia and Switzerland.

1. The principal imports to Hungary are cotton, woolen fabrics, wood, coal, yarns, machinery, leather, mineral oils, metals, paper and manufactured iron. The large imports from Rumania and Yugo-Slavia may be explained by the fact that these two countries ship great quantities of grain to Hungary for milling, since Hungary has the best milling facilities in Europe.

2. The principal exports are all agricultural products, chiefly flour, eggs and corn. An examination of Hungary's exports reveals that Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Germany, Yugo-Slavia, Poland and Italy are the principal consumers of Hungarian products.

Hungarian commerce has maintained her good reputation for two reasons: first because business men of foreign countries find in Hungary modern and reliable commercial enterprises based upon sound principles comparable to those of Western European countries; second, because the Hungarian Courts and judiciary system make no discrimination between nationals and aliens.

Since Hungary is principally an agricultural country, industry is a secondary consideration, although the government encourages the development of the latter. Budapest, which is the industrial centre of the country, ranks high among great European cities of importance. Moreover, in milling it is second only to Minneapolis, which is the largest flour milling centre in the world. The present wheat production of the country supplies an insufficient amount of raw material for the great flour mills of Budapest, which were built in proportion to the territory of pre-war Hungary.

Though Hungary possesses only limited resources of iron, ore and coal, the steel industry is one of importance. The textile industry is another line of manufacturing which has been making noteworthy progress during the last few years. The cotton textiles especially have developed rapidly with the number of spindles increasing by about 27 per cent and the number of looms by approximately 21 per cent during the years 1924-1925. Sugar production is also considerable in Hungary. In the season of 1924-1925, the production of raw sugar increased about 1,670 per cent, while that of refined sugar jumped over 2,670 per cent above the usual production. This indicates a definite progress. Since the coal reserves of Hungary are not sufficient for her needs, substantial quantities of coal are imported for the use of factories and railroads. On the other hand, a considerable portion of the output of anthracite which is exported commands a good price in foreign markets.

The National Federation of Hungarian Manufacturers counted 325 members in 1902. In 1905, the number of its members reached 350. At the outbreak of the World War the number of members had risen to 1,100, and today dismembered Hungary still counts 520 members in this federation, in spite of the fact that two-thirds of her territory was detached by the Treaty of Trianon.

INDUSTRY

A market for Hungary's agricultural products—before the post-war collapse—was assured within the pre-war territory of the late Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

The development of the great industrial centres of the monarchy in Austria and Bohemia was the result of a systematic Austrian policy directed toward the control of Hungary. Hungary exported her raw products to Austrian and Bohemian manufacturers, and imported from these same producers manufactured goods. And in spite of Austria's policy, industry in Hungary developed considerably before the War. For the famous sugar and mill products, spirits, beer, starch, sausages (the famous Hungarian Salami), vegetable oils, artificial fertilizer, products of wood distillation, cellulose, tannin, European markets were readily found.

The machine industry flourished when the country possessed abundant supplies of iron ores and coke. The Hungarian iron industry began centuries ago; at this time Old Hungarian high schools for the iron mining and smelting

industries existed in Upper Hungary (today Czecho-Slovakia), and were frequented not only by Hungarians but also by the youth of neighbouring States.

Before the war Hungary produced all the engines and machinery she needed, and had also a considerable surplus to export. She was robbed by the Trianon Treaty of her supplies of raw material for the iron and other metal industries. The country, however, continued to struggle to support these pre-war industries and succeeded in such a degree that they even gained importance in the post-war State. In certain cases the industry was able to raise her pre-war output by 70 per cent.

According to statistics the value of the industrial output of pre-war Hungary was 3,396 million gold crowns (about $ 815 million). Of this output iron, metal and machinery represented 807 million gold crowns (about $103 million), 23.7 per cent of the entire output. Post-war Hungary's output of these industries, in spite of all the losses and dismemberment, reached 27 per cent of the total industrial output.

The Hungarian electrical machine industry had a solid European reputation before the War. Electrical machines were exported both to the East and West from Hungary. The Treaty of Trianon also robbed this industry of her pre-war markets, but in spite of a grim struggle, the industry continued to maintain its old reputation.

The pre-war textile industry fully covered the home requirements of the country. The allotments in the Treaty of Trianon well-nigh ruined this industry, for today it is scarcely capable of covering 60 per cent of the country's needs. The textile industry produces cotton, flax, hemp, jute, wool and combed wool, silk, such half-finished goods as cotton yarn, flax, hemp and jute yarn, coco fibres, worsted, silk and artificial thread; and finished goods, such as cotton cloth, flax and hemp fabrics, jute fabric, woolen cloth, silk and half-silk fabrics, knitted goods, yarn and thread for the retail trade, haberdashery, oilcloth, miscellaneous textile goods, hats, clothing, linen, and other wearing apparel.

Among the Hungarian iron and metal industries yet to be mentioned are those which produce heavy machines, agricultural machines, boiler plates, ships and railway cars.

Most of these industries have declined, although the automobile and the shipbuilding industries are still fairly successful. Danubius, Schonichen & Hartman, Ganz still produce up-to-date ships. These factories built in 1914 the first Hungarian Dreadnaught "St. Stephen," all her parts being manufactured in Budapest. Hungarian factories also built the famous "Novara," the flagship of Admiral Horthy, on which he won his victory over the Italian fleet in the Straits of Otranto during the War.

There is scarcely an industry in post-war Hungary that was not turned backward in its progress, by the Treaty of Trianon, and the flour milling situation is still critical. While pre-war Hungary worked thirteen flour mills in Budapest with a daily capacity of 338 carloads of wheat alone, in 1925 it worked ten mills with a total output of 300 carloads.

A similar condition prevails in the once remarkable sugar industry. Other important industries, such as breweries, alcohol, and spirits have also declined for the same reasons.

The reader can see how the Peace Treaty of Trianon wrought havoc with the economics and finances of this small country. That Hungary was still able to recover financially and economically was due to the good will of the United States, Britain and Italy.

Still, there are some industries in which some progress is noticeable. For instance, the chemical industry, in which many branches have exceeded the production of former years; and it may be said that the whole industry has reached a flourishing condition, in spite of the fact that the Treaty of Trianon has deprived Hungary of practically all her raw materials, with the exception of certain vegetable products. The Treaty of Trianon deprived Hungary further of a large number of industrial establishments, manufacturing auxiliary materials for the chemical industry.

According to the latest data, the production of Hungary's coal mines shows some increase, but despite this increase, the imports of coal exceed the exports.

The leather industry also has increased.

The brisk activity in building operations has provided a large variety of industries with work. The brickyards of Budapest, for instance, whose

combined capacity is 300,000,000 bricks per annum, are working at full capacity. The brick manufacturers evidently envisage a continuation of building operations on an increasing scale next year and are trying to put in a stock, as last year's sales average only 160,000,000 bricks.

The cement industry also has raised its output. It seems very likely that this industry, many plants of which had closed down, will be put into operation again.

The industry of Hungary developed in a natural way according to the requirements of the population of Hungary. And as Hungary found that she was unable to obtain enough foreign markets for her industrial and agricultural products, other branches of industry had to be developed to provide her native consumers with goods they could not import. The population of Hungary is so dense and so united in comparison to those of the neighbouring countries, that such an industrial policy was imperative for the existence of the country. The density of the population per square kilometer in Hungary is 86, in Austria 78, in Rumania 55, Yugo-Slavia 48, Poland 70, in Czecho-Slovakia 97. From these figures we see that the density of population is greater only in Czecho-Slovakia.

The marked increase in the "unfavourable balance" is the consequence on the one hand of the increase in the imports of the raw materials and "half-manufactures" used in manufacturing finished goods, and, but to a much smaller extent, of finished manufactures, while, on the other hand, it is due to the stagnation which has set in in the exports. What should be looked upon with some apprehension in the growing adversity of the balance of trade is not that the imports have increased, but that our exports have not developed in the same proportion. The first task of Hungarian commercial policy should then be the creation of such conditions as will facilitate the extension of its exports. The experiences gained, as to the effects of the commercial treaties concluded so far, prove that the unreserved application on Hungary's part of the most favoured nation principle and the lowering of the industrial items of the autonomous customs tariff have not brought sufficient compensation in the shape of facilitating the agrarian exports of Hungary. Further, it has to be taken into consideration that the agricultural tariff policy of the countries of importance to the Hungarian agrarian export business is directed not so much by economic principles as by "political aims" of self-sufficiency. It becomes

evident that no illusions should be cherished in regard to the promotion of agrarian exportation by commercial treaties alone.

Should Hungary stop short with the policy of protective tariffs, it would result in the collapse of Hungarian industry, which in turn would prevent Hungarian labour from being employed properly, as it is now. Such a policy would prevent unnecessary immigration, for every State tries to find work at home for its labour.

A recent protocol of the League of Nations regarding the financial reconstruction of Hungary contained a recommendation and suggestion according to which Hungary should develop her agricultural industries and should, on the other hand, reduce the protection to other industries by concluding a commercial treaty, which under present conditions is hardly possible.

AGRICULTURE

As to the agricultural policy of the Hungarian government since 1913, small farm holdings have been increased by 550,000 hectares. The future of Hungary is very closely connected with a healthy agrarian policy. Nearly one million acres of land have been acquired by the Hungarian government from large estates to make the small farmer a land-owner. At present the small farmer in Hungary is provided with enough land (homestead) to live contentedly and to be able to provide for himself and his family. But while this means great progress in the agrarian and social policy of the government, it is still far from enough. Naturally, great policies take time for fulfillment. Incomparably greater success in agricultural production will be achieved if the development of the soil is more intensive, especially on the small properties. The latest statistics show great progress in this respect.

Certain branches of agriculture are already in a far better position than they were before the War; for instance, poultry and eggs. Hungary has today 1,500,000 acres of meadow land, which make excellent cattle pasturage. The latest figures show a tremendous increase in live stock, especially for breeding purposes, in many cases the figures being almost equal to or even higher than those of pre-war Hungary.

Great progress has been made in agricultural endeavour. Every country has an agricultural school and in certain sections there are excellently equipped winter agricultural schools. The policy of the government is that every village shall have a so-called Community House, equipped with reading, lecture and entertainment rooms, for the farmer and the farm hand.

There is scarcely any portion of Europe which so greatly resembles the American Middle West as does Hungary. It now contains one of the greatest grain producing areas in the world, smaller in area but comparable in productivity to the great "corn belt" region of America. The Hungarian soil, in spite of years of cultivation, is still rich and fertile, thanks in no small measure to the painstaking toil of the industrious Hungarian farmer.

Hungarian agriculture finds a natural aid of utmost importance in the Danube River, which, with its many tributaries, drains the whole of Hungary. The entire country, without exception, is suitable for farming.

60.2 percent of Hungary is arable land, 18.1 percent consists of meadows and pasture, 11.8 percent is forested. Orchards and vineyards amount to 3.4 percent. Marshes and uncultivated land are 6.5 percent. Even the marsh land in reality is rich and fertile, and needs only drainage to make it productive.

In area, present Hungary is more than twice the size of Belgium, Holland or Switzerland and is substantially larger than Austria. In population it is larger than Belgium, Holland or Austria, almost as large as Norway and Sweden combined. Hungary is larger in area than Maine, and is almost as extensive as Indiana. In 1934 it had a greater population than Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Nevada; more than Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, combined, and almost as great as Pennsylvania or Ohio and Indiana together. Hungary is the sixteenth country in area in Europe and eleventh in population. It ranks therefore as one of the most important of the lesser Powers of Europe.

Hungary produces a wide variety of crops, including the principal grains, vegetables, sugar beets, fruits, and an enormous quantity of the finest of grapes. The outstanding crops for which Hungary is famous are wheat and corn. As to wheat, Hungary has on the average a larger output than most of the nations of Europe, except Russia, France, Italy, Spain, Germany and Rumania, all countries very much larger in area. Relatively, however, wheat is

far more important in Hungary than in the countries mentioned, which are, with the exception of Rumania, normally wheat-importing countries. The production exceeds that of Rumania, Italy and Yugo-Slavia.

The increase of crops grows yearly. The value of the yield of plant farming, stock farming and forestry is estimated, according to the last data at 3,066 million pengös (about $536 million).

In Hungary, farming is carried on by methods which are in many respects similar to those of America. On the large Hungarian estates considerable use is made of agricultural machinery and less manual labour is applied per acre than in most sections of Europe. As a result, the output per man per hour is high, although the yield per acre is not so great as in other European countries. Hungary, like other European countries, is in a favourable position in respect to Western Europe. The countries need food, and are competing among themselves to purchase it while at the same time trying to secure markets for their own manufactured goods.

Especial attention is paid in Hungary's agricultural policy to horse breeding. The Hungarian horses are famous all over Europe and are very much in demand. For centuries almost all Hungarian governments have been active in building up State stud farms. The first Arabian horses came into the country in the 14th and 16th centuries, but systematic breeding started only about a hundred years ago.

FINANCES

The post-war finances of Hungary were left in the most chaotic shape by the Károlyi government and after him by the Bolsheviks. In 1925 Hungary requested the League of Nations for aid in the reconstruction of the national finances.

As a result, a plan was worked out by the League that was accepted not only by Hungary but by all other nations financially interested in Hungary. Jeremiah Smith, Jr., of Boston, was appointed as High Commissioner of the reconstruction plan.

A loan aided Hungary during the transition period. But long before this period was over, the Hungarian budget was balanced, and hence a large

portion of the loan became available for capital expenditures. And the reconstruction proved to be so successful that it was possible to turn over the control of the finances to the Hungarian government itself many months earlier than was originally planned for its transfer.

At the present time Hungary's finances are in a thoroughly sound and stable condition.

STABILITY OF THE CURRENCY

The stability of the foreign exchange of a country is one of the best indices of its economic prosperity and financial stability. Already in 1926, Hungarian exchange was as stable as that of Switzerland or Holland and only 0.1 % less stable than that of Sweden. In brief, it compares most favourably with the exchange of three of the countries of Europe whose financial position is unquestionable. At the beginning of 1926, a new unit of currency, the pengö, was introduced and has since then been the unit of account and exchange.

The National Bank of Hungary (The Note Bank), the only one of its kind in Hungary, was established as the bank of issue. The Hungarian Pengö was quoted in 1934 at parity with 17.5 American cents. The State debts to the bank have increased considerably since the establishment of the National Bank.

In pre-war Hungary 1,791 financial institutions were in business with combined resources of 13,654,000 gold crowns (about $3,276,960), of which amount 2,146,000 gold crowns represented capital and 11,508,000 gold crowns "outside capital," or capital entrusted to them by third parties.

In 1934 it was not compulsory for Hungarian financial institutions to join the Central Corporation of Banking Companies; in fact admission to it was a privilege preceded by rigorous censorship. Thus of the 1791 pre-war financial institutions only 1,296 became members of the Central Corporation of Banking Companies at its organization in 1916, of which 697 were on territory subsequently severed from Hungary by the Treaty of Trianon.

The combined assets and liabilities of the Central Corporation of Banking Companies and its member institutes were in 1916 11,305 million pengös and in 1926 was 2,250 million pengös.

Generally it can be said that the Hungarian finances have improved. The Hungarian currency was established in such an able way that even the financial districts of New York recognized Hungary as a place for excellent investments. This speaks for itself. Millions of dollars have been lent to Hungary, not counting. the loans issued by the League of Nations.

THE FINANCIAL MARKET

I want to point out the almost decisive influence exercised by the amount of note circulation and fluctuation in the rates of interest in connection therewith on all stock exchange transactions which during the period under review has been characterized, indeed, by the general stringency of money. The seasonal requirements of Hungarian agriculture combined with the increased activity of the principal manufacturing industries have had the effect of temporarily almost stopping up the channels of money circulation leading to the exchange. The satisfactory state of Hungarian business has been admitted on all sides and the favourable balance sheets of all the industrial and financial concerns show an increase of profit and continuation of the sound business of the country.

The Hungarian banking institutions are mostly powerful and are extended all over the country, and they enjoy the best reputation throughout Europe. The course followed by the Hungarian banks in answering attempts to raise the rate of interest on foreign capital by repaying their loans has had its effect; there are again plenty of offers from all parts of Europe and from the United States, which, however, are made use of only to a limited extent. It may be expected that the influx of foreign capital and the commencement of the exportation of the new crops will restore the former favourable aspect of the money market, as it is also to be expected that the next returns of the Hungarian external trade will show considerable reduction of the adverse balance of trade. There is good reason to hope that negotiations for a long term industrial loan begun in authoritative circles will come to a favourable conclusion. The beneficial effects of such a loan on Hungarian industries need not be separately emphasized.

HUNGARIAN RAILWAYS

At the outbreak of the World War in 1914, the entire length of the Hungarian State railways was 22,332 kilometers (58.8% vicinal or private railway corporations included). Today after the treaty of Trianon the State railways of Hungary together with the private rails are 8,650 kilometers long. The entire area of present Hungary is 92,916 square kilometers and in relation to her 8,500,000 population and for each thousand persons there are 1.05 kilometers of railroad.

While the direct traffic of the State railways decreased, as a result of the Trianon Treaty, after the World War a remarkable increase showed itself in the "transit traffic." This increase in transit traffic is due mainly to the creation of the Little Entente States. No one of them, with the exception of Austria and Bohemia, had an earlier developed commerce and industry. All the other states around Hungary were obliged to use the Hungarian State railways for their shipments. The transit traffic today, in fact, is about ten times larger than it was in pre-war times.

On the other hand, direct traffic decreased in comparison to the traffic of pre-war Hungary, but as the transit traffic increased the loss of the former is covered in the gain in the latter. As to the passenger traffic, there is a noticeable increase in comparison to the passenger traffic of pre-war Hungary. The tariff policy of the State railways of Hungary is of the utmost importance for the country.

The Royal Hungarian State Railways are incorporated like any other firm. The management takes entire care of the huge investment of the State in every connection, except where political questions are concerned. The State Railways have their own capital and reserve funds subject to an accounting at any time by the State.

The Tariff Board of the Royal Hungarian State Railways is composed of all authorities on finance, industry, commerce and other representatives of the State. The tariff policy of the Hungarian State Railways facilitates to a great extent the shipments from land to sea. In the transit tariff of Hungary naturally the ports of Fiume and Trieste play a very important role, especially

since Hungary has made new commercial and railway treaties with Yugo-Slavia and Italy regarding their shipments from land to sea. In 1924, Hungary shipped 700,000 tons of exports through Trieste against 390,000 in 1923. These figures have reached a far higher record since 1923, a fact which speaks well for the future of a maritime commerce for Hungary; and while tariff counted 4,500 carloads through Fiume in 1924, it is reasonable to say that this figure may appear many times higher after all the treaties of commerce are concluded and after all the jealousies and hindrances are weeded out of the way of mutual progress.

REPARATIONS

For twenty years starting 1924, January 1st, until 1943, December 31st, Hungary pays the following reparations: The payments have been fixed in natural services, cash or coal. For the following years:

Beginning from 1927, Hungary had to pay an average of 8.6 million gold crowns a year over ten years, increasing by 1 million a year from 5 million in 1927 to 13 million gold crowns in 1936. The Hungarian Reparation is fixed for twenty years according to the Dawes Plan, which is equal to a reparation amount of 200 million gold crowns.

The inter-allied debts since have been reduced by 19.3% for a number of countries in which Hungary was included.

15. THE FOREIGN POLICY OF HUNGARY

From the date of the battle of Mohács in 1526, when Hungary lost her independence and came definitely under the rule of the Habsburgs, until the recent collapse of the Dual Monarchy in 1918, we are absolutely unable to speak of a Hungarian foreign policy. Before the collapse of the Habsburg Empire the Hungarian State only shared the financial maintenance of the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Office in Vienna and the responsibility of the foreign policy of the pre-war Monarchy, but never had, with a few rare exceptions, any occasion or opportunity to initiate or even to suggest any diplomatic movements.

As a rule, Hungary was generally confronted by a "fait accompli" as the foreign policy of the entire Monarchy was directed from Vienna: the famous Ball-Platz, where the palace of the Foreign Office was situated. There Hungarian interests were seldom considered, although her geographical position, economical conditions, and mixed population entitled Hungary, very clearly indeed, to share in the Monarch's foreign policy. Even Bismarck, the immortal German, said in one of his parliamentary addresses that: "the balance of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy is not in Vienna, but in Budapest !"

But the regard in which Austria held Hungary before 1867 may be seen in the famous statement of Cardinal Count Kollonics, the Austrian Chancellor in 1687, and afterwards the Prince-Primate of Hungary, whose policy was as Hungarian historians describe him: "to make Hungary poor as a beggar, then Catholic and finally German!" After the Kossuth revolution, Francis Deák, the great statesman, called the attention of Archduke Albrecht, uncle of Francis Joseph, to the Hungarian Constitution. The Archduke, enraged, tapped vigorously on his sabre, exclaiming: "Here is the Constitution of Hungary," meaning that in the Austrian sword lies Hungary's Constitution.

The great antagonism toward Hungary, springing from various sources, had already warned the statesmen of the country, centuries ago, that Hungary must look for sympathetic allies.

Austria, for instance, threatened to Germanize Hungary. This particular policy of Austria had a far deeper significance than appears at the first moment. The Austrian policy was "to secure the great Danube River which crosses Hungary, for a safe road of transportation toward the East!" This policy of Austria was in line with the famous German aim of the "Drang nach dem Osten!" (The pressure toward the East).

After the battle of Mohács in 1526, which was a milestone in Hungarian history, the foreign policy of the country fluctuated for a long time between a Byzantine-Eastern and a West-European Orientation. While the former means to adhere to the costumes and religion of the Greek-Oriental Church, the latter means the adoption of the Christianity of the West-European States, which had been directed and of course supported by the policies of the Habsburgs.

Byzantinism never found enough followers in Catholic Hungary, and this stern opposition had much to do with the Turkish aggression against the country. It perhaps appears bizarre that several West-European Kings tolerated secretly, even openly, the Byzantine influence in Catholic and Protestant Hungary; but this was only on account of their own personal opposition against the Habsburgs. It was not only the "pragmatic sanction" in 1723 that Hungary came without the unit of a West-European Orientation, which in the end was a benefit to the Hungarian people.

Kossuth outlined a plan of a Danubian confederation without Austria, and he was eager to win for his ideas the states south and east of Hungary.

In 1867, the compromise between Hungary and Austria again decided the former in favour of the West-European Orientation in her foreign policy, chiefly for protection against Imperial-Russia and Russia's small Balkan allies. How logical this policy was, has been verified by the origin of the World War.

Unfortunately for the peace of Europe, the Treaty of Trianon again serves chiefly the interests of Slavic expansion and oppression, at the expense of Hungary.

And while Russia collapsed and at present the old Russian danger no longer exists for Hungary, the new lines which the Treaty of Trianon drew around the country revived the Slavic danger; Hungary is absolutely defenseless under

the present conditions, and she may be delivered to the mercy of her neighbours at any moment. Of course this was the real purpose of the militaristic peace treaty.

If you look at the map of present Hungary, an investigation will show that the northern or Czecho-Slovak boundary is only a very short distance from Budapest, the Hungarian capital. In the south, the Hungarian boundary is near the "detached" city of Szabadka (Subotica). Yugo-Slavia and the Czechs tried to establish a so-called "corridor," through which they hoped to be able to choke Hungary whenever they saw fit. From the West, there is no immediate danger because of the radical change in Austria.

But should Austria one day be incorporated in Germany, the proximity of a Germany with a population of 75 millions may bring some unexpected surprises.

"From its own point of view," Professor Dr. Karl Pribram and Professor Dr. Brockhausen, both from the University of Vienna, state, in "*These Eventful Years*": "Austria as well as Hungary could have lived at peace with all their neighbours. But the neighbours thought otherwise. For every one of those neighbours had still some 'unredeemed brothers' within the territory of the Monarchy."

After the collapse of Austria-Hungary, when Károlyi headed for a short time the government of mutilated Hungary, his and his Cabinet's foreign policy aimed again at introducing an Eastern Orientation. The creation of a sort of Eastern Switzerland was in the minds of Karolyi and his friends, but the idea had in reality no backbone and collapsed before its birth.

Since 1923 Hungary has been a member of the League of Nations. The structure of her foreign policy is peace—a pacific development to the highest degree, in spite of her impossible graphical boundaries. The framers of the Peace Treaty put down only impractical milestones as boundaries, in the Hungarian plains:

only militaristic reasons prevailed, either geographical, nor ethnographical; nor were the most necessary economical conditions investigated, for the simple reason that they all were in favour of Hungary.

To the foreign policy of any country belongs the tariff and custom questions. Therefore it is vital to say a few words about their pre-war and present conditions in Hungary.

The protective tariff of the old Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was an excellent guardian for home products, which developed into the so-called "tariff-union." This system remained as a legacy to Hungary after the War.

The Hungarian Peace Delegation in Paris asked the Allied and Associated Powers to be permitted to maintain the principles of this tariff system between herself and the newly created Succession States. But the Peace Conference more "reckless" than "receptive" remarked that it was "not going to interfere with the newly laid down economical policies of the Succession States, who are to-day the neighbours of Hungary."

This merciless verdict, which lacks by all means the vision of statesmanship and in any case practical and common business sense, was a deadly blow to struggling and almost ruined Hungary; it was worded: "The freedom of the New States freed from the Hungarian Yoke would be elusive if Hungary were to be permitted to maintain such a system."

What was, and what could be, the natural result of such a pernicious verdict? All the states wanted to protect their own industries and products by a newly introduced home-tariff and customs regulation. Immediately they introduced unprecedentedly high tariff-walls, and protective tariffs, which in daily practice became absolutely impossible, even for themselves. But this was not sufficient and "patriotic"; new laws were introduced, which forbade the customary imports and exports, and in concert with the Treaty of Trianon, the once-so-flourishing markets of Hungary collapsed.

Austria, but this came to naught. In 1921, with the assistance of the United States of America, a conference was held at Portorose (a small port near Fiume). Hungary's aim was to lower her own high tariffs toward her neighbours. The export and import prohibitions on certain articles were cancelled and new commercial treaties were prepared *but* at that time[1] not

1 See Chapter on Economics and Finances

executed, except with Austria. The only achievements were in the matters of railway, post, telegraph and passport.

In 1922 the International Economic Conference at Genoa brought some progress. In 1923 the League of Nations issued a financial report, with a severe and unfair criticism. The tendency of this report was to restrict Hungary solely to agricultural activities, with the aim of ruining Hungarian commerce and industry. The influence toward such an attitude came from Czecho-Slovakia.[2] Hence the vital problems of Hungary remained unsolved.

The actual Hungarian foreign policy began with the conclusion of the Treaty of Trianon. Her foremost aim in her foreign policy is, of course, the revision of the Peace Treaty. Without this revision it would be impossible for the country to develop soundly. The foreign policy of modern Hungary is entirely different from that of the late Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, which was dependent for her existence upon Germany. Since France looked malevolently upon this policy for so many years, Hungary was never able to secure the friendship of France nor that of Great Britain. The World War changed this situation, and made the statesmen of Hungary look back as far as 1848 to the outlines of Kossuth's foreign policy.

Among the newly created Succession States, France looks most sympathetically upon Poland. While France does not approve fully of the policy of the Czechs, she sees a guarantee for permanent peace in an alliance of England, France and Italy with Hungary and Poland.

Even Lord Rothermere pointed out as early as 1927 in his famous publication, "Hungary's Place in the Sun": "I should like to see our Foreign Office follow the lead which Italy has given to the Powers of Western Europe in holding out a helping hand to Hungary. Hungary is the natural ally of Britain and France. She has a right to a place in the sun."

2 In 1921 on January 27 the foreign minister of Czecho-Slovakia advised the League of Nations that Hungary should remain agricultural only, in order to be able to develop more powerfully the already strong Czech industry and make Czecho-Slovakia the chief marketing place for all the neighbouring countries.

The rights of Hungarian minorities daily gain in importance among all people interested in international affairs and concerned with the just and democratic defense of the rights of the unjustly treated minorities. The first steps in respect to defense were taken at the March meeting in 1929 of the League of Nations when Stresemann, the German Foreign Minister, and Senator Dandurand, the Canadian delegate, urged the Council to make an end of the sufferings of these peoples and suggested that a commission be sent to investigate and to propose remedies.

In previous chapters it has been shown that the Treaty of Trianon caused untold disasters to Hungary, and of the promises regarding plebiscites none has been kept, because these promises were in favour of the detached Hungarian minorities. During the past nine years these minorities have been attacked in their very existence by the Succession States and it is high time to arouse the public opinion of the civilized world and to demand that the League of Nations be reminded to carry out the meaning of the promises of Trianon.

THE HUNGARIAN MINORITIES

Dismembered Hungary is unable to develop fully under the present unjust oppression of the terms of the Treaty of Trianon. The natural progress of this thousand-year-old country is closely connected with the final and peaceful solution of the problem of this disposition of almost 3,500,000 Hungarians who now live under intolerable conditions on the territories which were awarded to the neighbours of Hungary for “services rendered.”

The men sitting at the Peace Conference after the Armistice were misinformed and deceived by the statements of the newly created States. Students of international affairs will remember the article in the French *Matin* in 1918, written by Dr. Benes, the Foreign Minister of Czecho-Slovakia, suggesting to the Entente the temporary annexation of that part of Hungarian territory which today is called Slovakia. Dr. Benes emphasized the fact that this annexation was necessary to prevent the spread of Hungarian Bolshevism in Europe. But he forgot that Bolshevism in Hungary was the work of Soviet Russia, and that Bolshevism had ceased to exist in Hungary as soon as the agents of the present Soviet Russia had been driven from the country by Hungary. Since then, moreover, the world realizes that the Hungarian people

were able to handle this situation without the “benevolent intervention” of Dr. Benes.

On the other hand, the strongest Communist party in all the parliaments of Europe today is in Czecho-Slovakia, while Hungary is now “Bolshevik proof” and is recognized as one of the best organized and best governed countries in Europe. Hungary today is a national and cultural unity—a condition not the case with her neighbours.

Along the North Hungarian frontiers, now in Czecho-Slovakia, is a section of Hungarian territory on which 911,000 Hungarians of the purest Magyar stock are living. There are also 82,000 Germans and 121,000 Ruthenians in contrast to the 395,000 Slovaks. This territory was taken away from Hungary and given to Czecho-Slovakia, purely for militaristic reasons.

When the Trianon Treaty created the Succession States after the World War, militaristic policies awarded to Czecho-Slovakia important Hungarian cities with strategic railway centres. Among others, the city of Kassa, now in Slovakia, with a purely Hungarian population, has a very important railway junction.

The same unjust conditions prevail on the eastern frontier of Hungary, the Rumanian border, where 551,000 Hungarians, 36,000 Germans and 350,000 Rumanians live in the immediate neighbourhood of the boundary line.

Another territory, Hungarian for a thousand years and allotted to Rumania by the Treaty of Trianon, is the Székely land in Transylvania, a typical Hungarian territory inhabited by 550,000 Székely-Hungarians, 12,000 Germans and only 124,000 Rumanians. In other words, 1,113,000 Hungarians and Germans as against 474,000 Rumanians live in these lands. The decisions of the Treaty of Trianon by which Hungarian property was ceded to her neighbours were made again for military and strategic purposes.

On the Serbian or Yugo-Slavian border, the South border of Hungary, are intermingled 264,000 Hungarians, 60,000 Germans and 50,000 other non-Yugo-Slav races, while there are only 79,000 Yugo-Slavs. This Hungarian, German and non-Slavic population is anxiously waiting for the plebiscite guaranteed them by the Treaty of Trianon. But the League of

Nations is not yet inclined to grant this right nor even to give any hope of justice to these minorities who wish to return to their Motherland. And since the League of Nations will not act in this matter, the public opinion of the world must step in and demand the revision of this treaty.

It must be understood that Hungary does not claim those prewar territories which are inhabited by Slav majorities but asks in the name of justice those territories outside her present frontiers in which the majority of the population is Hungarian and German. Since these two races strongly resent Slavic rule, this is one of the most important questions in Europe, one that must be settled and one that casts a shadow over peace and contentment.

CZECHS AND SLOVAKS

Since the Treaties of Trianon and Versailles, a great literature has developed on the question of the minorities. The Czech propaganda claims that the Slovak nation is an integral part of the Czech nation, that the Slovak language is a dialect of the Czech language and that together the two nations form a cultural, geographic and historic unit. This view is not held by many authorities on the subject; and regarding it Louis Steier made the following statement, "There is no Czech culture in Upper Hungary." Anyone familiar with geography and history must see at once the unreliability of the Czech theory: it is false, the work of politicians, and has often been repudiated with reliable arguments.

The Czechs have never lived in Upper Hungary now called Slovakia, nor has there ever been a Czech culture there. On the contrary, the Slovaks, Germans, and Magyars inhabiting this territory have developed their own cultures. Although the Slovaks are the remnants of an earlier migration than the Magyars, they were influenced by the Germans brought to Upper Hungary in the time of St. "Stephen and later. These cultures have merged with, and been nourished by, Hungary, but have never been influenced by the Czechs. The oniy Czech invasion in Upper Hungary was at the time of the Hussite 'Wars. After a few years, Giskra, the Czech leader, was driven back to his own country by the Hungarians.

It is not new to say that a Czecho-Slovak nation does not exist. The Slovaks protest vigorously against such a union. But there is a Czech nation, a

Moravian nation and a Slovak nation. The Czech culture developed under the influence of the Germans, and as Louis Steier said, “The Slav character of the Czech people has been warped just as the popular character of the Czech people has lost its Slavic peculiarity.” Although the Czech language is entirely different from that of the Slovaks, the Utopian dream of the Czechs, nevertheless, to merge with the Slovaks and form a Czecho-Slovakian language is a political ambition. This the Slovaks do not share.

“Slovak culture and literature, however, has not felt foreign influence to so great an extent,” said the Hungarian historian and archeologist Pulszky. “The Slovak language preserved its original Slav character during the migrations of the folk-wanderings and there are no records of the Slavs in the territories ruled by mightier people. Dating from the migrations we are more likely to come across records of the Slavs in Croatia and Serbia.”

In the time of the folk-wanderings, Upper Hungary was swept in turn by the Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Gepidae, Longobards, Dacians, Marcomanni, Quaded, Huns, Avars, Slavs, and Magyars. After the invasion of the Hun-Avars, peaceful Slav tribes quietly settled there and did not molest the tribes who crossed this great thoroughfare on their way from the far East to the West. They led a quiet pastoral life, managed by the Franks, under whose influence they adopted Christianity. Thus the first cultural influence in Upper Hungary came from France and not from the Czechs. The policies of the Hungarian Kings of the House of Arpád and of the Italian-French House of Anjou facilitated the development of culture and, through the organization of the Church, the building up of flourishing towns which are still in existence today in Slovakia. In this section, every castle, every church, every fortress, every library, school, college, and university is of Hungarian origin. But the Slovak people have remained Slav despite the great influence of the Magyar culture. The Hungarians have not attempted to divert their national character, but instead have left intact the Slovak language, the fundamental condition and external vital element of a national culture.

During the long centuries of loyal friendship between the Slovak and Hungarian nations strong ties of blood have been established. The two races acquired skill, knowledge and art from each other and at present it would be hard to determine what part of the Slovak culture other than the language is of purely Slovak creation.

Many Hungarian writers, artists and statesmen originated in the Slovakian or Upper Hungarian Highlands. The immortal Kossuth claims this section as his birthplace. John Kupeczky, Ferenczy, Huszár, Strobl, Ballo, Stetka, Benczur, Szinyei, Katona, Baron Mednyánszky and many others who have grown to be masters of Hungarian art are imbued with the most loyal Magyar feeling and Hungarian patriotism. There are, however, no traces of Czech art in Slovakia.

A very old Slovak song pictures the loyalty of the people for Hungary:

"Prosime Ta Boze nás

Prosime Ta Boze nás

Hej zachran Uhrov Kazdy cas,

Nech z Tvej svatej poroci

Nech z Tvej svatej poroci

Hej vzdy z vitázá nad Turci!"

meaning "We pray Thee, God, protect the people of Hungary at all times that with Thy Holy aid they may ever be victorious over the Turk."

The historical ties between the two nations are described in this Slovak poem:

Nebudem v Suránoch Lez pojdem bojovat

Hej, az bude volat,

Nedám sa prinutit

Sam pojdem do boja

Hej, s Uhry husárami

Oddám sa do zbroja"

meaning, "I cannot remain at Surány. I am going to fight as soon as Rakóczy calls me to the colours. I am not forced, but of my own will I recruit, ho! I will take up arms with the Magyars, with the Hussars."

Because of her origin and development, Slovakia could logically have been made an independent State with her own government and parliament in the readjustment after the World War. But there is not much hope for political happiness in the present union of the Czechs and the Slovaks as Czecho-Slovakia.

THE YUGO-SLAVS

In Hungary's long fight against the Turks, the Serbian population adjoining Turkish territory was needed by the Habsburgs for defense. So the Viennese government granted the Serbian Church great privileges in various parts of Hungary. The spread of the Serbian Church on pre-war Hungarian territory had reached its highest point before 1690. More than thirty-eight monasteries and convents, many of them existing today, had been established.

After 1690, about 40,000 Serbian families followed the retiring Austro-Hungarian armies into Hungary. They were protected and encouraged to settle in southern Hungary, since their homes were constantly in the line of Turkish attack. Leopold I. issued his "Diploma 1690" on August 21, granting national rights and church privileges to the new settlers. Under the rule of Charles III., conditions in Serbia were still uncertain and from 1737 to 1739 and from 1787 to 1789 large numbers of Serbians again settled in the South of Hungary and in Croatia. In 1751, more than 100,000 Serbians living on pre-war Hungarian territory emigrated to Russia. Wishing to counterbalance this loss in population, the Viennese government, with imperial patents, formed leishofrics for the Serbian Church which was independent of the Patriarch of Ippek, head of the Serbian Churches outside of Hungary. In order to keep the patents the Serbian Church engaged in several long struggles in later years.

In 1847 and 1848, the Hungarian Parliament enacted a law granting the Serbian Church full autonomy in church and school matters under state supervision. This, however, did not prevent later expressions of dissatisfaction. The Treaty of Trianon left only the Serbian Episcopal District in Buda (Budapest), a district dating from 1552. In Hungary today there are seventy Serbian churches with about 24,000 adherents.

For more than a thousand years Serbians have lived sporadically along the Danube. They were of the Oriental Orthodox faith and accepted Christianity

earlier than our ancestors, the heathen Hungarians, who became Roman Catholics. Members of the royal and aristocratic families of Serbia in earlier centuries intermarried with the royal families of Hungary and the Hungarian aristocracy. To save life and property from the Turks, the Serbians came to Hungary in increasing numbers and even fought with the Hungarian army against the Turks in the battle of Mohács in 1526.

In 1848, the Serbians on pre-war Hungarian territory joined the "Yllir movement" inaugurated by the Habsburg government against Kossuth and Hungarian independence. However, General Damjanics, by birth a Serbian, one of Kossuth's greatest generals, was an outstanding exception.

When Hungary was dismembered, the pre-war Serbian population in the South of pre-war Hungary was allotted to the present Yugo-Slavia, of which the old Serbian Kingdom is the nucleus. Croatia and Slavonia, other parts of pre-war Hungary, were then allotted to Yugo-Slavia. These two countries as independent kingdoms had had autonomous governments and national assemblies even before the general Conflagration. Their people belong to the Roman Catholic faith and not to the Eastern Orthodox Church, as do all the Serbians. Their language and culture is also essentially Western European in character.

TRANSYLVANIA AND THE SZÉKELYS

Transylvania has been allotted to Rumania by the Treaty of Trianon. The territory consists of 102,787 square kilometers and according to the census of 1910 there were altogether 5,265,444 inhabitants of which 2,800,000 are Rumanians, 1,705,000 are Magyars, 560,000 Saxons of German origin, 54,000 Serbs and 146,000 Slovaks, Croats and Bulgars. Hungarian population does not show isolated islands surrounded by a sea of Rumanians in large compact masses.

The Hungarians living in this district as called Székelys. They are the nucleus of the Magyar race in Transylvania and have played a prominent part in the politics of the country. For centuries before the year 1848, the political power in Transylvania had been divided among the three principal nationalities, the Magyars, Székelys, and Saxons, all of whom had their own administrative organizations and voice in the policy of the country. These ethnical and political facts were well known to the Council of Four in Paris. Article XI of

Chapter I of the Treaty of Paris made between the Allies, Associated Powers and Rumania says, "Rumania agrees to accord to the communities of the Saxons and Székelys in Transylvania local autonomy in regard to scholastic and religious matters."

G. Le Bon, the French sociologist, wrote in ~*Enseignements Psychologiques de Ia Guerre Euro péenne,*" "In Transylvania there are 1,540,000 Rumanians against 386,000 Hungarians, 560,000 Czechs, 234,000 Germans and 54,000 members of other nationalities." According to M. Le Bon, "there are 560,000 Czechs in Transylvania," but in reality there is not a single one living in that part of the country. It is an old trick of politicians and Rumanian propagandists to refer to the Székelys under a foreign name in order that people who have no knowledge of the ethnographical situation will be misled. M. Le Bon counted the Székelys, who are of the oldest Hungarian race, as Czechs, and thus supported Czech interests.

The Székelys became Hungarians more than 1200 years ago. A small fragment probably of the Huns, who had previously inhabited the territory of pre-war Hungary, remained in that section of Transylvania in which the Székelys now live, and during the long centuries became a valuable part of the Hungarian nation. Michael Werböczi, the famous jurist and codifier of the Hungarian laws, wrote, as early as the sixteenth century, "The Székelys are noblemen par excellence and have their own laws and privileges. They are learned in matters of war, and offices and inheritances are divided among their tribes and the branches of the tribes." These historical records clearly show that the Székelys were a vital part of the Hungarian nation even as early as the Árpád Dynasty, playing an important role in the military and political affairs of the Magyars.

The kings of the Arpád and following dynasties continually used the Székelys for military purposes and in return granted them outstanding rights and privileges. Whole communities of the Székelys were created Hungarian noblemen and enjoyed the rights and privileges of the Hungarian nobility. They were exempt from taxation. The only impost was that every Székely land owner was to send an ox to the king at the time of a coronation, the marriage of a king or the birth of a crown prince. This was called "oxbranding" because the oxen were branded with a special stamp.

The properties of a Székely could not be seized under any circumstance, and even after death without an heir, the estate remained in the tribe, not passing

to the Crown of Hungary, as did the properties of the Hungarians. The principle of this privilege was that the entire Székely properties were not considered as belonging to one individual but to the whole tribe, and as such were inalienable.

In 1437 the three nations living in Transylvania, the Magyars, Sz&elys, and Saxons were united in defense against the Turkish attacks and the peasant rebels in the so-called *"unio trium nationum"* under the patronage of the King of Hungary. From this union was born the constitutional Transylvania.

The Székelys had an autonomous national existence and government, electing their own administration. Verancsics, the historian, said: "The Székelys appear at their assembly in arms. The chiefs sit in a circle, the others stand around them and protest clamorously if a decision is about to be taken of which they do not approve. If a resolution is passed against their will, they turn against the man whom they regard as its originator and revenge themselves by attacking his home and pulling down his house. If any one tries to curtail their liberties, they will pursue him with arms, and if they can catch him, will kill him in front of the assembly."

The privileges of the Székelys were renewed in the *Diploma Leopoldiana* (King Leopold II.) which is the Digest of the Transylvanian Law. This Diploma said "The Székelys, this most war-like people *(siculi genus bellicosissimum),* shall, in the future as in the past, be exempted from taxation, billeting, the payment of tithes and other burdens. In exchange they shall do military service at their own expense for the defense of the country."

The Székelys fought heroically for the independence of Hungary in the wars of Francis Rákóczi II. against the Austrians and under Maria Theresa against the Prussians. They took part in the Succession wars of the Habsburgs, in the Silesian and Napoleonic Wars and in the wars against the Turks. In 1848 and 1849 during the Hungarian Revolution against Austria, the bravest soldiers in General Bem's army were the Székelys.

The Székely culture was Hungarian as was their language. Frescoes in their churches depicted scenes from the lives of the canonized kings of Hungary. In all the schools connected with the churches, the Hungarian language was taught. The Székely people were acquainted with the art of writing even before their conversion to Christianity. They used a kind of cuneiform script

which continued as late as the sixteenth century. Not only are there manuscripts of this period, there are also inscriptions on the facades of one or two fifteenth-century churches. This writing is a variation of the ancient Turkish script, the oldest example of which is in the so-called rock inscriptions of Orchon. It is certain, therefore, that the Székelys brought this cuneiform writing as an inheritance from their Asiatic home.

At the time of the Reformation, the Hussite translation of the Bible in the fifteenth century was popular among the Székelys and the popularity of Protestantism was not due to the great landowners in Transylvania who generally followed the principle of *"cujus regio, ejus religio,"* but to the common people who took to their hearts the Lutheran, Calvinist, Unitarian and Anabaptist faiths.

In the seventeenth century a great many middle schools were founded in the Székely towns. The high schools of Kolozsvár (now called Cluj) became famous centres of Hungarian learning. The English traveller, Lord Fitzgerald, wrote that the Hungarian race had been preserved by the physical and intellectual activity and the natural fecundity of the Székely people.

Among the Hungarian writers of Székely origin are Clement Mikes of Zágon, who described in his beautiful "Letters from Rodosto," the sufferings of the Hungarian emigrants in Turkey after the Rákóczy wars, and Péter Apor of Torja who holds in his "Metamorphoses" of the transformation of Transylvania after the country lost her independence and came under the Habsburgs.

Peter Bod of Héviz wrote the "Hungarian Atheanas," biographies of Hungarians. John Czere of Apácza was the first to acquaint Hungarians with the philosophy of Descartes. Alexander Csoma was the greatest linguist and philologist of the Hungarian language. According to Rajendrola Ia Mitra, the greatest Sanscrit authority of the nineteenth century, Csoma was also the author of the best work on the literature of Tibet. "His modesty concerning subjects on which he was an accepted authority," wrote the English man of letters, Torrens, in his report to the Secretary of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, "was the most admirable thing in his character." The Encyclopedia Britannica says that "his fame had reached his native country and procured for him a pension from the Government which, with characteristic devotion to learning, he gave to the purchase of books for Indian libraries."

The inventors of the non-Euclidean geometry were the Russian scientist Lobatchewsky, and the two Bólyais, father and son, of Székely extraction. The results of Lobatchewsky's work in this connection appeared in the Russian language in the publications of the Academy of Sciences in Kazan during the years 1829-1838:

Farkas Bólyai's "Tentamen," with John Bólyai's "Appendix" were published in Latin in the year 1832 in Marosvásárhely. Thus did these three men of genius, the Russian and the two Székelys, all unaware of each other's existence, live and work far apart from each other "creating new worlds out of nothing." The Székelys' work, says the Encyclopedia Britannica, "reveals a profounder appreciation of the importance of the new ideas, but otherwise differs little from Lobatchewsky's." The order of their achievements was problematical until the letters of the great German mathematician, Gaus, were published, proving that the Székelys, the two Bólyais, had been the first in the field.

The Székelys can be characterized as an entirely different race and people from the Rumanians. They are far superior, and for centuries they have been intelligent and true citizens of Hungary. But until the present day the inhabitants of old Rumania, the Wlachs, have long been kept down politically and mentally. The Székely is generally a serious man of deep qualities. He is truly religious but never intolerant; for the country is divided between the Protestants and the Catholics. The house of the Székely has taste and comfort in its simplicity. Székely embroidery, pottery and carpentry are famous throughout Europe.

Before the World War, the kingdom of Rumania "Regat," had a geographical area of 130,000 square kilometers and after the war 304,244. In old Rumania, seventy-eight per cent of the village population over seven years of age could not read and write. The Rumanians living on the territory of pre-war Hungary were far better educated than were those living on Rumanian territory, according to the official census which proves that of the former only twenty-six and three tenths per cent were illiterate while of the latter fifty and six tenths per cent could not read or write. This is a fair key to the relative advancement of the Székelys and Rumanians.

REVISION

The Peace Treaty contains 113 pages of 364 articles, of which the author considers articles 11 and 19 of the most vital importance to mutilated Hungary.

This importance is shown in the second part of Article ii which states that "It is also declared to be the friendly right of each member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends."

Nevertheless, the international legal basis for a revision of the Treaty of Trianon lies in Article 19 which says: "The Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by members of the League, of treaties which have become inapplicable, and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world."

Count Apponyi, the Chairman of the Hungarian Peace Delegation in France, declined to sign the Treaty of Trianon. He resigned from his office when this catastrophe fell upon the thousand-year-old National State.

Some of the leaders of the Peace Conference felt it imperative to take a serious step, make a sort of promise in good faith to calm the excited public opinion of Hungary, expressed by Count Apponyi so dramatically by his refusal to sign the treaty.

No less a personage than the French Premier, M. Millerand, at that time the President of the Peace Conference of the Allied Powers, wrote the following letter to the Hungarian Government, to ease the tension in Hungary. This historical letter of M. Millerand I call the "codicil" of the Peace Treaty of Trianon, part of which reads as follows:

"An inquiry on the spot perhaps reveals the necessity of altering certain parts of the frontier line provided for in the Treaty, and should the Boundary Commission consider that the provisions of the Treaty involve an injustice at any point which it would be to the general interest to remove, they may submit a report on this matter to the Council of the League of Nations, if requested to do so by one of the parties concerned, may under the same

conditions offer its services to obtain by a friendly settlement the rectification of the original tracing in places where the alteration to the frontier is considered desirable by one of the Boundary Commissions. The Allied and Associated Powers feel confident that this procedure constitutes an appropriate method for removing any injustice in the tracing of the frontier line which may give rise to well-founded objections."

Only such a letter by a man of so great importance as President Millerand of the Peace Conference was able to restore a just hope in the hearts of the desperate Hungarians. M. Millerand pledged with his indorsement not only the honour of France but also the honour of the Allied and Associated Powers. Lord Rothermere declared that this letter of M. Millerand also involved the prestige of Great Britain.

So far nothing has happened except that the public opinion of the entire world has been aroused by men like Count Apponyi, Lord Rothermere, Lord Phillimore (the late Lord Justice of Great Britain), Lord Newton, the late Viscount Bryce (late Ambassador of Great Britain to the United States), Sir Robert Donald, Senator Robert L. Owen, E. Alexander Powell of Virginia, and many statesmen and writers of great importance about whom I shall speak in the chapter on "Revisionism."

Neither was it a mere accident that Jean Seydoux, the noted French statesman and the late political director of the French Foreign Office, wrote an editorial in the German "Germania," an organ of the German Centrum party, on August 6, 1928. In this article the French diplomat, who died in May 1929, wrote his "swan-song," his farewell words of peace to the world, saying that "At the Peace Conferences in Paris the economical principles have not been regarded and as the frontier lines of the various new countries have been drawn they paid no attention at all to the fact that the navigation of the Danube River is the aorta, or the vital blood circulation, for all the States in the valley of the Danube." He says further, "One of the most important problems is the frontier question of the so sadly cramped Hungary of today. . . . Was it necessary to attach new racial *complexes* to the newly-created *States?*" On this point the French statesman says: "This I do not know with certainty, but I have no doubt in my mind that the present frontiers of post-war Europe ought to stand as they are for a period of time because in this way only is it possible to judge if those foreign races could and will ever be able to assimilate themselves with the people of the new régime."

He continues: “From many happenings I can draw the conclusion that along the Hungarian border big connections of thorough Hungarian complexes are living which are trying to re-attach themselves to their old country. But the fact should always be taken into consideration that this question which is so vital for Hungary cannot be solved without the understanding of the neighbouring States of that country. The new frontiers of Hungary have not been drawn according to the necessities of ethnography and the interests of economics but they have been drawn purely from a military standpoint. Yet in spite of this fact, Hungary,” says M. Seydoux, “can reach only with peaceful and rational politics her final aim, namely, to regain her lost territories and her segregated masses of fellow countrymen.”

But most important for the present foreign policy of Hungary, and I venture to say for the foreign policy of all her neighbours, is what M. Seydoux declares further: “The new frontiers will lose their so-called economical and political meanings to the newly created States in that moment in which the neighbours of Hungary are convinced that the national minorities which have been awarded to them and which are the bone of contention at present are not willing to assimilate themselves with them, and cannot expect that those minorities will ever melt into the new states and therefore logically will come to the conclusion that they serve their own interests if they return the detached minorities again to the former country, Hungary.”

“The present frontiers of the new Czecho-Slovakian republics,” he continues, “have been drawn for the purpose because the new territory of Czecho-Slovakia is more easily defendable in this form. If the relations between the two countries (Czecho-Slovakia and Hungary) will develop to such an understanding of the situation” (which this author sincerely hopes will occur, since in both countries are there men of true vision of justice and of true democracy) “that military point of view will lose all its importance, and in that case the impregnability of the Czecho-Slovakian republic will voluntarily surrender a possibility to Hungary according to which the frontiers between the two countries can be changed according to Hungary’s wish, in which case the south part of Slovakia would be attached again to Hungary as well as other parts in question.”

The French diplomat finishes his most interesting essay as follows: “Naturally in this case the military and economical controversies have to be separated step by step without any passion, any intolerance, any belligerence on the part of

Hungary, because such expression of feeling would challenge antagonism not only in the neighbouring states but also in France."

The Chancelleries of Europe listened seriously to Jean Seydoux's important publication, in the eminent German paper. At Geneva, Aristide Briand, the French Foreign Minister, stated that after the World War, "certain countries" received more land than they were entitled to receive.

The future existence of the Hungarian nation depends entirely upon a just revision of the Peace Treaty of Trianon. There are two orientations regarding the readjustment of Hungary's frontiers. One, the so-called Rothermere frontier, requests less than the other orientation of those political circles (Parliamentary parties) who ask for more than does the powerful British sponsor of the Hungarian Revision.

It would not be in the interest of Hungary, if certain politicians would overbid each other for the price of popularity in promises which they will never be able to keep!

The battles of the World War were fought by soldiers. It was the gravest mistake to let them, with no knowledge of statesmanship, draw the new frontiers of the defeated countries.

ARBITRATION

The great land dispute between Rumania and Hungary after the World War is still fresh in the minds of the people. The cause of the Hungarian citizens, robbed of their fortunes and homes, was taken up by the champions of humanity, the British, and caused many bitter debates in the British House of Lords. In the chapter of "Britain and Modern Hungary," the reader will find a discussion of these atrocities by the greatest minds in England. Also Lord Rothermere, in his historic publication, "Hungary's Place in the Sun," quoted in the same chapter, rises to splendid heights of indignant eloquence over the outrages committed by the Rumanians upon Hungary.

The first statesmen to turn the flashlight upon the harm wrought by the Rumanians through their "land reforms" after the war, 'were Count Albert Apponyi and the Canadian Senator Dandurand. Later the distinguished members of the Hungarian commission at Geneva directed the attention of

the League toward arbitration, which came into effect during Hungary's fight for the lost properties of its former citizens now under Rumanian rule.

Pre-war Rumania, with no idea that she would annex Transylvania, had decided upon some agrarian reforms. After the war, new land reforms were introduced which have resulted in the destruction of uniformity in the kingdom. The partition of estates in old Rumania, Bessarabia, Bukovina, and Transylvania was regulated by four different acts passed at four different times by the Rumanian Parliament, a fact which caused much contradiction and confusion, and above all, injustice. In July, 1921, an act was passed regarding Transylvania, limiting absolutely the maximum of land to remain to each original owner, but saying nothing about the amount which could be taken from him.

The currency in Hungary depreciated so greatly that the former Hungarian citizens whose lands were expropriated by the Rumanians, received only about 5 per cent of the real value of their property, according to Art. 50 of the Rumanian agrarian law. Moreover, Art. 85 gives the State the right to pay, not by cash, but by means of non-transferable annuity bonds bearing 5 per cent interest and redeemable within fifty years.

Land reform in Rumania, as in Czecho-Slovakia, was characterized by corruption and nourished by bribes. No attention was paid to the people who claimed the lands, simply because the officials were dividing the land among themselves. Such transactions as were made were conducted in a immoral manner deeply loathed and detested by the entire Cultured World.

In the distribution of lands, pre-war Hungarian citizens have been treated unjustly as compared to Rumanians. More than 23,000 Hungarian Peasants whose properties were expropriated were allowed to retain only small fragments of their former land.

Very much differently were the Rumanian peasants treated. While the Rumanian farmer received as many hectares of land as he had sons who were trained in agriculture, in Transylvania only one son was recognized.

So far the League of Nations has not accepted the authority of the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal concerning the land dispute between Rumania and

Hungary. The two countries, therefore, agreed to analyze matters themselves by conferences.

16. GREAT BRITAIN AND MODERN HUNGARY

For centuries Great Britain has proved herself a staunch friend of Hungary. Despite the fact that the two countries fought on opposite sides during the World War, no one knows better than the statesmen and people of the great British Commonwealth that Hungary was forced to enter the war, by her political connections with Austria; and no one came more quickly or more cheerfully to the aid of the war-torn land of the Magyars, except perhaps the United States of America. Both Great Britain and Italy early recognized that a strong Hungary in the valley of the Danube was a vital necessity to the peace of Europe.

When Austria obtained the aid of Russia in 1849 and the Tsar's armies swept over the Hungarian mountains, the British government protested against the invasion simply because it was opposed to any *demarche* that would bring Russia closer to the Mediterranean or increase Russia's influence in the Balkans. Great~ Britain's traditional friendship for Hungary, and the British love of freedom, were well displayed by Lord Palmerston when he sent British warships to Constantinople to prevent Turkey's extradition to Austria of Louis Kossuth and his friends, who fled there after the failure of the Hungarian revolution. What would have been the fate of Kossuth, had not Palmerston stepped in, it is possible only to imagine.

Besides Kossuth's immortal memory, there are other ties between England and Hungary already mentioned in the chapter on Education; as for example the link formed by the Hungarian scientist Alexander Körösi de Csoma, the great linguist who was the first to edit and compile the Tibetan-English dictionary. What this compilation of the Tibetan language meant for British administration in India is self-explanatory to the intelligent reader. The introduction of a new cultural implement to millions of people in the far East brought far-reaching consequences. The Royal British Geographical Society in India raised to the memory of this great Hungarian a lasting monument at Darjeeling, at the entrance of the Himalayas, and carved words in the marble which have gone down in history. The writer of this book placed a wreath at the monument's steps in 1926 at the occasion of his trip around the world.

Another great tie between Britain and Hungary was created by the great scientist and traveller in the far East, Dr. Armin Vámbéry, the learned scholar of the Royal University of Budapest.

Further associations between England and Hungary exist through the life of the beautiful Hungarian Countess Claudina Rhédey, who was the grandmother of the Queen of England, and the great-grandmother of the Prince of Wales. The Rhédey family is one of the oldest aristocratic families of Hungary. Countess Claudina was born in the castle of St. George, one of the most romantic and charming places of Transylvania. At the court of the Habsburgs, the beauty of the Hungarian Countess charmed the royal Prince Alexander of Wurttemberg, who at that time was one of the young officers of a Hungarian Hussar regiment, and she became his wife. Their son was Francis, who became Prince of Teck, married the British Princess Mary Adelaide, and was the father of the present [written in 1934] Queen of England. Francis's son Adolph, renounced his German princely title during the World War, and received the title of Marquess of Cambridge from his brother-in-law, the King of England.

In memory of her Hungarian grandmother, Queen Mary erected, in the Protestant Church of the small village of St. George, a marble slab on which the carving in English and Hungarian reminds the reader of the much loved and acfmired descendants of the beautiful Countess Claudine Rhédey.

After the war Great Britain again manifested her friendship for Hungary. Lord Bryce, the celebrated Historian and a former British Ambassador to the United States, before the Treaty of Trianon had been concluded, delivered an address in the House of Lords on Wednesday, December 17, 1919. He said in his memorable speech, that he wished— "To ask his Majesty's Government if their attention has been called to the Memorial recently presented to the Council of Five assembled in the Peace Conference at Paris by the three Bishops of Transylvania (Roman Catholic, Calvinist, and Unitarian) setting forth the persecutions and cruelties which are, as they state, being inflicted upon their people by the Rumanian Military Authorities occupying that country, and also praying that an inquiry may be made into the conduct of these authorities and an end put to the oppressions now being practiced by them."

The Viscount continued: “After the Armistices had been concluded with Germany and Austria, the troops of Rumania pressed forward into Transylvania with the will of the Allied Powers, and that they followed the retiring Austro-Hungarian troops through that country and ultimately into Hungary, and they arrived finally at Budapest. It is also within your knowledge that their conduct in those countries was anything but creditable, and it called for the attention of the Allied Powers, who were obliged to remonstrate with them on the way they were behaving.

“What is Hungary’s crime? Their crime is that they fought against us. That is perfectly true. But the Czecho-Slovaks and the Poles and the Yugo-Slavs and all these other people, whom we now greet as friends and brothers, fought against us too. They were obliged to, though none of them liked it. They had to fight, and the difference between them, as I said just now, is that we hail those other races as friends and brothers, whereas we treat the Hungarians, who fought in just the same way as they did to the end, as if they were our bitterest enemies. But, admitted that they have comniitted a crime—the crime of fighting against us, the crime possibly of being partly responsible for the war—can any one contend that they have not been heavily punished already? Hungary is a State which was formerly one of the most flourishing States in Europe. It is now practically bankrupt, and it is half starving. The people have suffered four months of Bolshevism, and although we have had no experience of that in this country, we can form some idea of what it means. In addition to that, they have had to suffer from a Rumanian occupation, dating from last summer, which is continuing still. I called attention to this matter a few weeks ago and pointed out the extreme hardships which were being inflicted upon Hungary. I cited the opinion of British officials in Hungary, who estimate the damage done at over $8,000,000,000, and, so far as I know, that occupation still continues although they may have retired some insignificant distance. This is bad enough.

“But what makes the position almost intolerable for these unfortunate people is that they are surrounded by a ring of hostile States. Hungary really is in the position of a man who has had a paralytic stroke and is being constantly kicked and cuffed by his former associates and dependants. In addition to all these actual and tangible evils they suffer from other misfortunes. I observe that they have the misfortune to suffer from a very bad Press both here and in France. I never pick up a paper of advance views without seeing long statements about what is called the White Terror which is supposed to be in

full force in Hungary today. I have very grave doubts myself as to whether the White Terror exists at all[1]. It is very easy for the Government to substantiate these statements. Why do they not publish the Report of the British representative in Budapest at this moment? It has been promised but nothing has been produced yet. It would put an end to these charges which are constantly being made with regard to atrocities committed under what is called the White Terror.

"Another grave offence which these unfortunate people have committed is that they have expressed a preference for a Monarchial form of Government. I can understand an objection to individuals in a Government, but I cannot conceive any reason why other nations should prevent a civiised Government from having that form of government which it prefers. In Hungary there is universal suffrage; not only every man but every woman has the vote, and if they are eccentric enough to prefer a Monarchial form of Government and eventually to select some extremely uninteresting royal personage as the head of the State, why in the name of common sense should they not be allowed to do so? In my opinion a Monarchy is no greater danger to the peace of Europe than a Republic. Of the six European countries who succeeded in keeping out of the war five of them were Monarchies, and there is no evidence in history, so far as I am aware, to show that a Republic is necessarily a more peaceful Goveminent than a Monarchy.

"I refuse to believe that the attitude of His Majesty's Government is represented by the attitude of the British and French Press. I do not believe that His Majesty's Government are animated by any hostile feelings towards Hungary. I am convinced that they are just as much averse to any unnecessary mutilation of that country as any one on this House. It is an open secret that the Italians are in favour of modifying the proposed conditions. It is evident, therefore, that the pronounced hostility of which I speak exists elsewhere in other quarters.

"The confidence felt by Hungary in British impartiality and in British justice is so great that I believe that anything which emanates from us would be willingly accepted, and it is for this reason that I regret that the negotiations

1 See Appendix: Charles Repington's Diary.

with regard to this Treaty are being conducted at Paris, instead of in London. The conditions, whatever they are, whatever they eventually turn out to be, will no doubt be severe. If they are extremely severe there may be considerable difficulty in getting them accepted peacefully in Hungary. But if those conditions were arrived at in this country, and if the Hungarians had an opportunity of putting their case before impartial opinion here, I believe that, whatever the decision was, it would be accepted more or less cheerfully and without protest by the Hungarians."

Lord Montagu of Beaulieu then rose from his seat: "My Lords, perhaps I may be excused if I say a word or two upon this subject as I have just returned from Hungary and Budapest, where I had an opportunity of seeing at first hand some of the matters which have been alluded to today. I went out there with no preconceived notions, and I tried to look at the matter entirely from an impartial point of view. I went out primarily to examine into questions of transport both by rail and road, and naturally that brought me into contact with other problems, because transport after all lies at the base of~many other problems, especially those of the supply of food and of commercial prosperity.

"I came to the conclusion very soon that as the country is now divided for the purposes of the Peace Treaty the divisions are not only unworkable but are extremely harsh. At the present moment there is nothing but economic chaos in the whole of Austria-Hungary, and unless something is done to revise the Treaty I am afraid that bad will become worse, and that what is now a danger spot in Central Europe may break into an eruption which will affect other countries far to the west. The last speaker alluded to the question of the railways being divided. The present position of the Hungarian railways is that what used to be main lines are divided up amongst two or more countries, and, speaking as a railway man, I consider that the railway traffic of both Austria and Hungary is almost unworkable at a profit under present conditions. At every place where the railway crosses the frontier you will have, if there is no revision of the Treaty, to set up new arrangements for immense sidings, customs examination points, and new locomotive sheds, and all the expense of that will have to be put on a country which is now in a semi-bankrupt condition. And it would be a perfectly useless as well as an immense expenditure. There is also great difficulty even in regard to transport on roads, for we cannot expect one Government to carry on a system of repairing its main trunk roads if the next country which owns the continuation of those trunk roads refuses to do anything to them. It was

brought home to me very much that the old Austria-Hungary was a State of mixed and sometimes antagonistic races, but it had at any rate an economic unity. Now the four countries into which it has been divided have their own national flags and a new autonomy, whereas under the old system they were all one.

"It seems to me that it is useless to have a new nationality and to possess a new flag if you starve under it, and that is the position there today. Not only are very heavy dues raised by these entirely artificial frontiers, but in some cases there is an actual prohibition so that you get this ridiculous state of affairs. Near the frontier one town may be starving for lack of fuel or food, and just over the frontier will be a district or town which could supply those things, but is not allowed to do so. There was a saying at the beginning of the war that it was a war to end war. I think so far as the Central Empires are concerned, if I may parody that saying, that this is a peace to end peace. I cannot conceive any division of these countries which, looking to the future, whatever may have been their sins in the past, can be justified. The division, certainly as regards the future, seems to me insane and unworkable."

Lord Sydenham, rising, said: "My Lords, there is only one point which has not been alluded to in the interesting speeches which we have heard, and that is this. Are these new countries, which are to be set up by order of the Supreme Council, really wise in taking over a large number of people who will almost certainly be in permanent antagonism to them? The Rumanians are going to take over, I think, rather more than 1,250,000 Magyars. Are they wise in so doing? Those people will not forget the hardships and the cruelties which the Rumanians have inflicted on Hungary. Will it not add immensely to the difficulties of these new countries in starting their new Governments to have on their hands these alien populations which will dislike them, and would it not be a greater kindness to these new nations—would it not give them a better start in life—if these great annexations were denied to them? I hope that His Majesty's Government will take the steps which have been advocated so strongly tonight and will send out a fully qualified Commission to look into the matter on the spot and see how far nationality can be made the guiding line to the new frontiers and how far self-determination can be applied to these nationalities, which are strongly opposed to the proposals which are at present before us."

Viscount Bryce during the discussion added: *"What I desire to make clear is that Transylvania consists of three parts, and the Rumanian population is only a majority. . . . Not even a majority of two-thirds; therefore there is no reason why Transylvania should be treated as one and assigned to Rumania. It is easy to discriminate those parts of Transylvania which are properly Rumanian from the other parts; and I hope that when the Treaty with Hungary is being finally considered Transylvania will not be treated as a whole but the parts which are not Rumanian should be left to be Saxon or Magyar as the case may be."* He said further:

"The Rumanian soldiery treated Transylvania (the Hungarian population) not as soldiers should have done it." Viscount Bryce, the historian and statesman, emphasized especially that the Rumanian claim to the whole of Transylvania and a large part of Hungary is most unjust and it is not based on true facts of the case. Their claim there is still less well grounded. *"I ought to add,"* the statesman continued, *"that the claim which the Rumanian Government makes to the whole of Transylvania and to the 23 counties of Hungary, practically means the economic ruin of Hungary. The, civilization of the Rumanian people and of Rumania is on a distinctly lower level than that of the civilization of Hungary and therefore it would be a "come-down" for the population of Hungary to be ruled by those who would come as officials, etc. No rights of property have been regarded."*

"Still worse," continued Viscount Bryce, *"that certain outrages have been committed and that priests and women and old men have been publicly flogged. An impartial Commission ought to be appointed (English, American and Italian) in order to determine what the proper boundaries are! Hungarian people ought not to be let under Rumanian rule. This is a grave injustice which could not be tolerated.*

"History teaches us great lessons," Viscount Bryce said, *"but people never learn. England's justice will not participate at the sure consequences for not carrying out the self-determination of that large part of Hungarian population—taken away from Hungary and placed under Rumanian rule. I do not believe that the Hungarians would acquiesce. Before too late, justice for that high-spirited fine race, the friends of England for centuries, ought to be obtained."*

Lord Newton, another great champion rose in the British House of Lords on March 30th, 1920, who presented the worthy case of Hungary with Czecho-Slovakia and Yugo-Slavia, similar to Lord Bryce.

"The worst feature in all this is the fact," said Lord Newton, *"that something like three and a half millions of Magyars—and about 1,500,000 German-speaking Hungarians are to be transferred like so many animals from one country to another. I confess that I thought that one lesson which the world had learned during recent years was the inexpediency of annexing alien races, against their will, and without giving them "any say in the matter. I think it might be contended with much plausibility that had the Germans in 1871, contrary to the advice of Bismarck, not demanded the whole of Alsace and Lorraine, it is quite conceivable that the war between Germany and France would never have taken place, etc."* Lord Montagu of Beaulieu spoke similarly.

Lord Weardale rose and addressed the House of Lords in a warm, most interesting speech about the defects of the Peace Treaty of Trianon which cannot be accepted as final.

So have been valuable speeches delivered for the case of Hungary by Lord Birkenhead, Lord Buckmaster, Lord Curzon, Lord Parmoor, Lord Phillimore, Major Elliot, Commander Kenworthy and others. Levellyen, M.P., and Sir Robert Gower (late parliamentary secretary to Premier Baldwin), visited Hungary recently and studied the latest conditions there. They got in contact, especially the latter, Sir Robert Gower, with the Hungarian League[2] for Revision of the Peace Treaty of Trianon, and with its able President Francis Herczeg (Hungary's greatest writer and member of the Hungarian Upper House of Parliament). After his visit, Sir Robert Gower organized the second British Parliamentary Committee composed of 125 members of the House of Lords and Commons. Great Britain's interest is undoubtedly very active in this great and just European question.

2 The League was organized after the publication of Rothermere's famous article.While it's ostensible purpose was domestic propaganda, it maintained highly qualified "secretaries", diplomats in all but name, at major countries in Europe whose assignment was to keep the idea of the treaty revision alive. The executive director of the League was Dr. Endre Fall, vice-president of Hungary's health insurance service, OTI. A vigorous anti-Nazi organization, during World War II the League was active in trying to arrange Hungary's exit from the war. Endre Bajcsi-Zsilinszky M.P., executed by the Nazis, was, for example, a member of the League (Ed.).

Lord Bryce is dead, but his noble spirit lives strongly in the public opinion of England toward Hungary.

On June 11, 1927, Viscount Rothermere published his famous article in the London *Daily Mail*, "Hungary's Place in the Sun." This article, which may be called an historical declaration, presented to the world the point of view of most of the thinking people of Great Britain.

The following political study published in all the Rothermere papers in the British Isles, and also in various American and continental European journals, aroused the world's public opinion from its lethargy. Lord Rothermere had been with his brother, Lord Northcliffe, an outstanding supporter of the war against the Central Powers. "English blood had flowed in vain of the hundreds of thousands of Englishmen, if the cause of the World War had been not worthy of the fight," said Lord Rothermere in one of his great public pleas for a real peace. He, as an able interpreter of the powerful public opinion of Great Britain, had already recognized that the blood of the hundreds of thousands of Englishmen had flowed in vain. Great Britain and the rest of Europe did not fight for permanent war, but for permanent peace.

Viscount Rothermere, who had studied conditions in Hungary published the following political study from Budapest on June 11, 1927:

"Eastern Europe is strewn with Alsace-Lorraines. By severing from France the twin provinces of that name, the Treaty of Frankfort in 1871 made another European war inevitable. The same blunder has been committed on a larger scale in the Peace Treaties which divided up the old Austro-Hungarian Empire. They have created dissatisfied racial minorities in half-a-dozen parts of Central Europe, any one of which may be the starting-point of another conflagration.

"Of the three treaties which rearranged the map of Central Europe, the last and most ill-advised was that of Trianon, which Hungary was called upon to sign on June 4, 1920. Instead of simplifying the network of nationalities existing there, it entangled them still further. So deep is the discontent it has created that every impartial traveller in that part of the Continent sees plainly the need for repairing the mistakes committed.

“As they now run, the frontiers of the new Central European States are arbitrary and uneconomic. But they have a more serious aspect still. Their injustice is a standing danger to the peace of Europe.

“When we remember the circumstances under which was imposed upon a handful of Allied statesmen the task of remodelling the map of the world, it is not surprising that minor parts of their gigantic work should have been hurried. The division of the territories of the Austro-Hungarian Empire naturally appeared to some of them a less critical matter than the settlement with Germany. The principal delegates were content *to rely for advice and counsel on the representatives of the smaller Allied nations, bordering on Austria-Hungary,* and on the subject nationalities of the Habsburg Monarchy which during the war had come over to our side.

“But the Allied Premiers failed to make allowance for the fierce jealousies and greed which prevail among the medley of races left in Central Europe by historical tides of conquest and migration. There can be no doubt that, in the various treaties thus drafted, justice was sometimes sacrificed to rapacity, with the result that much of Central Europe is now *in a thoroughly Balkanized condition* of unstable equilibrium.

“We in England have so many grave problems of our own to face that we are inclined to dismiss these half-forgotten Peace Treaties as things settled once for all. But no one acquainted with the affairs of Central Europe can take that placid view. The hands that imposed the political conditions now existing there sowed the seeds of future war.

“The instability of the peace settlement was shown by the fact. that the three Central and Eastern European States, Czecho-Slovakia, Yugo-Slavia and Rumania, felt themselves obliged to form immediately a military alliance, backed by France, for the maintenance of the Treaties, especially the Treaty of Trianon with Hungary, which contained obvious defects and injustices.

“That alliance, known as the Little Entente, still exists, though at its special conference last month the attitude of the three States towards Hungary was noticeably less aggressive than in past years. This development is doubtless due to the fidelity with which Hungary, though always protesting against the unfairness of her Peace Treaty, has continued to carry out its terms.

“The Little Entente, indeed, is fast losing its international value. Alliances of such a kind, if they are prolonged after the need for them has disappeared, may themselves become perils to international peace. It is seven years this month since the Treaty of Trianon was signed, and those who know Central Europe best are beginning to ask whether it would not be wise to adjust some of the obvious shortcomings of that particular Treaty in the calmer spirit which prevails today.

“The first benefits of such a step would be reaped by the nations of the little entente themselves. Rumania, for example, has inherited a deadly feud with Russia in annexing Bessarabia. Whether Russia remains Boishevist or not, Rumania must always reckon with the possibility of having to defend her newly won rich frontier province by force of arms. In such a campaign she could have no hope of success unless her neighbour to the west were an entirely friendly State. This never can be the case under existing conditions. For the transfer of Transylvania from Hungary to Rumania involved the handing over to Rumanian rule of one-and-three-quarter million Hungarians. The majority of these are so intermingled with a predominantly Rumanian and German population that Hungary has reconciled herself to their loss. But lying immediately outside her existing frontier are two compact blocks of Hungarians, numbering about 600,000 people. Considerations of a strategic railway were mainly instrumental in securing the transfer of this population to Rumania. Matters of such insignificance must not be allowed to keep the war-spirit alive in Central Europe.

“Similarly, should Czecho-Slovakia, to whom the Peace Treaty annexed more than a million Hungarians, become involved some day in a dispute with Germany over the 3,000,000 Austro-Germans who were brought within her northern frontier, it would be to her advantage to have got rid of all preoccupations on her southern boundary. Friendship with Hungary, based on a reasonable readjustment of the frontier, would, moreover, be a step towards a Customs Union under which both countries would greatly benefit.

“Hungary’s third neighbour, Yugo-Slavia, on the south, took over as a result of the Peace Treaty 400,000 Hungarians, most of whom live in a corner of the former province of Croatia, formed by the angle of the Rivers Drave and Danube. Mixed up with them are about 300,000 Germans who would certainly prefer to be returned to Hungarian rule. To Yugo-Slavia, whose situation, both internal and external, is at the present time more critical than

that of any European country except Russia, it would be an access of strength to get rid of this dissatisfied racial minority on her northern border. The new frontier, varying but little from the present one, could be drawn without interfering with the Croat section of the old Austro-Hungarian province which was joined up with Serbia to make the kingdom of Yugo-Slavia.

"By such comparatively simple changes, two million of the 3,300,000 Hungarians, whom the Treaty of Trianon placed under foreign domination, could be reunited with their own race. Ease would thus replace friction with no alteration of the main lines of the peace settlement and without appreciable change to the balance of power in Central Europe.

"I suggest that the time has come for the Allied Powers who signed that arbitrarily drafted instrument—the Treaty of Trianon—to reconsider the frontiers it laid down, in the light of the experience of the past seven years. When an arrangement does not work well, after a trial of seven years there is a strong probability that it is inherently unsound.

"In modifying the terms of peace imposed on Hungary, the intricately mixed populations of the territories concerned should be consulted. They have had time to make up their minds to which nationality their instincts and interests unite them. The plebiscites to be taken in each area would need to be under the control of the Government of the United States or some other disinterested nation, for in certain of the ceded territories there is abundant evidence that the Hungarian inhabitants do not enjoy the liberty of speech and opinion which the Treaty of Trianon intended to secure to them.

"I urge this revision of the Central European situation as much on the ground of expedience as of justice. Rumania, Czecho-Slovakia and Yugo-Slavia are very largely dependent upon foreign credit for any national progress they may hope to make. This means that they are doomed to stagnation, and perhaps to decay and disintegration, unless they can convince the financial houses of London and New York that no acute frontier questions are outstanding to imperil the security of loans made to them.

"If the difficulty of obtaining foreign credits is not already felt by these small and precariously situated Allied States of Central Europe, it is only because they have hitherto been able to take advantage of the naïve optimism of investors, mainly on the other side of the Atlantic. I notice that New York

financial houses have lately been floating loans for the city of Belgrade. As things now stand in Yugo-Slavia, I cannot imagine any less attractive investment. At the present moment the Yugo-Slav Government is putting forward aggressive claims to interference in the affairs of the small Albanian Republic, her neighbour on the shore of the Adriatic. This policy has its rise in the fear that Croatia may secede from Yugo-Slavia and thus deprive the Yugo-Slav kingdom of nearly all its Adriatic coastline. The Yugo-Slav Government hopes for compensation in a subordinate or a subjugated Albania.

"The result of this forward policy has been to bring Yugo-Slavia into a position of growing hostility, if not of collision, with Italy. The question of who controls Albania—as a glance at the map will show—is quite as important to Italy as is to England the question of which Power holds Calais and Boulogne.

"The peace of Central Europe is of direct importance to Great Britain. We cannot afford to leave it at the mercy of small and relatively unimportant nations which owe their expansion, and in some cases their existence, to the sacrifices of the Allies in the war. For generations past the Balkans were regarded as the focus of the danger of international conflict. It was there that the Great War actually broke out. *And now, as a result of the insufficient knowledge and hurried decisions of the Allied Peace Delegates, that long-standing Balkan peril has been extended over a much wider area. We ought to root up all the dry grass and dead timber of the Treaty of Trianon. before some chance spark sets fire to it. Once the conflagration has started it will be too late.*

"The parochial prejudices of small States must not stand in the way of European security. One of the aims of the Little Entente was to prevent a monarchial restoration in Hungary. Why should not the Hungarians have a king, if such is their wish, so long as they conduct their affairs in a peaceful and proper manner? Rumania and Yugo-Slavia, which threaten to invade Hungary if she calls back her royal house, are both monarchies themselves.

"We can safely show confidence in Hungary. She had only a minor part in provoking the Great War. And while Hungarians fought courageously for the cause with which they were associated, they treated British residents in their country with indulgence throughout the war, allowing them to lead their ordinary lives without internment.

“Within a few months of the Armistice, defeated and broken as they were, the Hungarians had enough energy and national spirit left to overthrow Bolshevist tyranny which fastened itself upon their country under the infamous Béla Kun. By so doing they saved Europe from having in its midst a plague-spot from which a campaign of corruption would have steadily been carried on.

“Next followed the dismemberment of Hungary by a treaty the severity of which was deplored by many Allied statesmen at the time. It reduced her population from nearly 21,000,000 to 8,000,000 and her territory from 125,000 square miles to 36,000 square miles.

“Hungary was glad enough to lose some of the peoples, like the Czechs, Croats, and Rumanians, which had been incorporated with her under the Dual Monarchy. But along with them were ceded nearly 3,500,000 Hungarians by race and language. And the country’s territorial losses involved the sacrifice of her entire supplies of wood, salt, and iron, three substances most essential to a population almost entirely agricultural. So ruthless was the Peace Treaty that Hungary even found herself required to deliver the large quantity of construction timber for her own needs.

“In her fulfillment of the Peace Treaty Hungary has given the Allies no trouble. She has balanced her Budget, and today her working-class and peasant population is in as prosperous a condition as before the war. Two million acres of ploughland have been purchased by the State from large proprietors and divided among small-holders with the result that no country in Europe has cheaper and better supplies of freshly grown food.

“I should like to see our Foreign Office follow the lead which Italy has given to the Powers of Western Europe in holding out a helping hand to Hungary. Hungary is the natural ally of Britain and France. She has a right to a place in the sun. The attitude of the Hungarian nation towards Germany today is one of distrust and resentment. So long as the memory of the war survives a renewal of her old relations is impossible.

“Likewise the resumption of the old bond with Austria is out of the question. The feeling against Austria is today as strong as it was after the defeat of Kossuth’s war of liberation in 1849, when the Hungarian national leader

found refuge and sympathy in England. It is to Western Europe that Hungary looks for international friendships, and now is the time to cement them.

"A people like the Hungarians, with a thousand years of national and constitutional tradition behind it; with a medieval record as gallant defenders of Europe against the Turks; with a Magna Charta of its own the "Golden Bull" of A. D. 1222, only seven years later in date than our own—is not to be treated like a newly formed Balkan State of upstart institutions and inexperienced politicians.

"I should like to see our Foreign Secretary show his interest in Hungarian affairs by giving personal attention to the attempt by Rumania to burke an appeal to international arbitration—as provided by the Peace Treaty—on the part of a large number of Hungarian farmers in Transylvania, who have been expropriated of their lands by the Rumanian Government without compensation. This matter has been before the League of Nations for some time. Britain, as one of the signatories of the Treaty of Trianon, has a direct responsibility to see that right is done.

"For stabilizing and pacific effect, however, no influence is more important in Central Europe than that of the great financial houses of London and New York. They have this matter in their own hands. If they refuse to make money advances to the States which are responsible for maintaining the present precarious situation there, it will not be long before the result of that policy begins to show itself in the adoption of adjustments and understandings which will greatly reduce the potential causes of war.

"Of the alteration of the Peace Treaties by violence or threats there can be no question. Any former Allied or enemy nation which tried to bring about new changes in the map of Europe by force of arms would be opposed—in the interests of self-preservation—by the joint resources of the Allied Powers. But the exercise of wise financial caution by the banking firms which are invoked to help the newly constituted states of Central Europe would have a beneficent and tranquilising force. Reasonable rectifications of frontier difficulties, carried out advisedly and calmly under this influence, will strengthen rather than endanger the peace of the world."

Immediately upon the publication of this article, there ensued a controversy between the Czech Foreign Minister, Dr. Benes, and the great Englishman,

Lord Rothermere. Their correspondence is herewith introduced. In a telegram sent from Prague on July 22, 1927, to Lord Rothermere, Eduard Benes, in response to an open letter addressed to him, expressed the opinion that the British Tory leader was poorly informed on Central European affairs and offered to give him all the necessary information regarding the position of national minorities in both Czecho-Slovakia and Hungary. The uselessness of such information is self-evident.

As was reported in special cablegrams to the *New YorkTimes*, and the rest of the world, Lord Rothermere's campaign in his own paper and in the Hungarian press, in favour of restoring to Hungary a large part of the territory taken from that nation under the Treaty of Trianon, aroused much indignation in the Little Entente countries. It appears that, following the publication of the original Rothermere article on Hungary in *The Daily Mail* on June 20, Dr. Benes was interpellated on the matter in the Czecho-Slovak Senate's Committee on Foreign Affairs, and that his answer reached the British publisher's eyes in a somewhat distorted form.

The Rothermere open letter to Dr. Benes, as given in the *Pester Lloyd* of July 21, reads as follows:

"To his Excellency M. Eduard Benes, "Foreign Minister of the Czecho-Slovak Government, "Prague.

"Through a news agency telegram I learn that your Excellency, in answering an interpellation in the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Czecho-Slovak Senate, made the remark that the apparent object of my article, "Hungary's Place in the Sun," was to prepare the way for a future war among the Succession States. This is just the opposite of my intention. So far as I am concerned, I entertain the most friendly feelings toward your country and instead of wishing to provoke a war, my object is, rather, to promote peace.

"I have much too high an opinion of your Excellency's political ability and experience to assume for a moment that you would be able to regard peace as assured if regions and strips of territory with an overwhelming majority of Hungarians were kept within the union of the Succession States.

"You know as well as I that the Peace of Trianon was put through without there being sufficient data at the disposal of the representatives of the Great

Powers to instruct them properly in the complicated territorial questions bound up with the definite settlement.

“Today there are sitting in Prague in your Parliament, Hungarian men representing districts which never should have been detached from Hungary and whose population, sooner or later, will make an effort to be reunited with their fatherland.

“More than 900,000 British soldiers and sailors did not sacrifice their lives in the Great War in order to stabilize injustice in any part of Europe.

“Today Hungary already has friends who will not rest until the whole world awakens to a consciousness of the injustices to which Hungary has been subjected. In one of the Succession States, the Hungarians in the district separated from their old fatherland are excluded from all administrative and judicial offices. They are forbidden to express their ideas in their own tongue to the authorities and the courts. The Hungarian language is barred from their schools which, one after the other, are gradually being abandoned.

“In Article 232 of the Trianon Treaty, there was set up a definite system of liquidating the property of Hungarian citizens seized and sold in Czecho-Slovakia. In view of the assertions made in this Connection, Your Excellency will surely admit that it would be desirable for your Government to publish the entire list of the seized and sold Hungarian estates, with the names of those to whom these estates were sold, with the amount of the purchase price and with some conclusive data regarding the question of the valuation of similar estates at that time, and finally, with information about the methods used in deriving the income from such estates.

“I earnestly ask Your Excellency to undertake the steps suggested, and at the same time to bear constantly in mind the fact that Czecho-Slovakia could not exist at all without the good-will and friendship of England and France. The victory, to attain which Great Britain made such great sacrifices, never was intended to serve as a cloak for injustices. If, however, there is such an abuse, then, when the time of danger comes for Czecho-Slovakia, your country will discover that the sentiment of the English nation toward it will have turned into a feeling of disillusionment and indifference.

I trust that Your Excellency will give to my present letter the same publicity received by your speech before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Prague Senate and I shall then doubtless

find it possible to return to this matter again in my newspapers.

"With the greatest esteem,

ROTHERMERE."

Lord Rothermere published in the New York *Evening World*, September 3, 1927, the following article in defense of Hungary:

"Paramount with the Allies during the war was the desire that when peace came it should be permanent. Whatever else victory might bring, the men and women of the allied nations wanted it to insure that there should be no more Alsace-Lorraines to keep the war spirit smouldering.

"It was the professed aim of the Peace Conference when it gathered in Paris in 1919 to rearrange the map of Europe on the basis of self-determination. But as its work went on this principle faded from sight. The result has been that Central Europe today is piled high with the materials for a new conflagration.

"The primary cause of this is the partitioning of the Hungarian nation among its neighbours by the Treaty of Trianon, imposed upon Hungary in June, 1920, which transferred in compact masses, contiguous with the main body of the Hungarian people, 600,000 Hungarians to Rumania (out of a total of 1,750,000, most of whom are intermingled with the Rumanians), 1,000,000 to Czecho-Slovakia, and 400,000 to Yugo-Slavia.

"In the peace treaty made with Germany the principle of self-determination was so thoroughly applied that a plebiscite was even held in Schleswig to revise the frontier which the Prussians had imposed upon the Danes in 1864.

"But with the signing of the Treaty of Versailles the principal Allied statesmen relaxed their efforts. The task of settling with their chief enemy had been a prodigious one. Their powers of personal application were exhausted. The

affairs of their own countries urgently claimed their attention. The drafting of peace terms with Germany's minor allies seemed to them a secondary matter they might well leave to the subordinate members of their delegations.

"For similar reasons the world's interest in peacemaking evaporated, and the light of publicity which had been concentrated on the work of the conferences was withdrawn. In reality only half the work of restoring a lasting peace to Europe had been performed. But the importance of what remained to be done was overshadowed by achievement already accomplished, and the remaining treaties were left to be drafted behind closed doors and signed amid general indifference many months later in various suburbs of Paris.

"This negligent procedure suited very well the intrigues of various minor nationalities which had become associated with the Allied cause and which stood to profit considerably from the settlements thus obscurely made.

"Representatives of these newfangled nationalities immediately began to arrive in large numbers in Paris. There, with the aid of certain doctrinaire pamphleteers of allied nationality, they set themselves to pulling every available string to insure that the particular peace treaty affecting their own small State should be as profitable as possible to their public and private interests. This was how grave abuses containing the sure seed of future wars crept into the Central European peace settlement.

"These abuses were committed in the name of self-determination. If that principle had been strictly observed all around there would have been no cause for complaint. But the creation of Czecho-Slovakia was an artificial operation carried through only by outraging the very principle of nationality it was supposed to serve.

"There never has been a state or nation of Czecho-Slovakia, although in the middle ages there had existed a kingdom of Bohemia whose independence ended in 1620 and whose last Queen was a British Princess, Elizabeth, daughter of James I. The frontiers of this state, however, had no resemblance to the post-war creation of Czecho-Slovakia.

"The union of the Czechs with the Slovaks had only been brought about as a result of a meeting held in Pittsburgh, Pa., during the war, at which the Slovaks, upon the pledge of autonomous home rule for their people in any

future Czecho-Slovak I state that might be formed, agreed to support the demands of Czechs when a Peace Conference should assemble. The conditions of this pledge, like those of the subsequent Treaty of Trianon, have not been carried out by the present Czecho-Slovak Government, with the result that bitter recriminations are now being exchanged between the two chief racial sections of the new republic.

"To find territory for this hybrid state the peace delegates at Paris were reduced to expedients in direct conflict with their proclaimed principle of self-determination. Not only were 3,000,000 Austro-Germans incorporated in it but its borders were extended to the south by the inclusion of a compact mass of 1,000,000 Hungarians of entirely different race and language from the Czechs.

"These people and the Hungarian delegation at the Peace Conference protested bitterly but unavailingly against their fate. Its injustice was tacitly admitted by the Allies at the time in a covering letter dealing with the Treaty of Trianon written by M. Millerand, the French Premier, which contained a promise that the frontiers laid down should, if necessary, be revised.

"No sooner had the Czechs got control of the Hungarian population ceded to them than they began to subject it to oppression by the side of which the Germanization of Alsace-Lorraine pales into insignificance. The Czecho-Slovak Government adopted toward its Hungarian minority population a deliberate policy of expropriation which has continued unchecked up to the present.

"The compensation for the seized property was so insignificant that it was virtually confiscated. No financial accounts of this expropriation have ever been published, nor have repeated appeals to the Czech Government resulted in their production. If only half the stories told about these land deals are true the Czech Government is responsible for tolerating some of the worst frauds that have ever taken place in the public life of Europe.

"No heed was paid to expostulations of the twelve members of protest whom this Hungarian minority (despite the dragooning of the electorate by the Government) returned to the Czech Parliament, nor did the injustices done attract any attention elsewhere in Europe. It is only now, when the great Allied nations have more leisure from their *own* problems, that they are beginning to

learn how Czecho-Slovakia and Rumania have twisted and distorted the Treaty of Trianon.

"By their greed and oppression these two states have created two new Alsace-Lorraines, which are nothing less than festering sores in the heart of Europe.

"Such conduct is specially odious in the case of Czecho-Slovakia, for this state is a spoilt child of fortune. Apart from a handful of Czech legionaries who came over to the Allies, the Czechs fought on the side of the Austrians to the last. It was thus a curious freak of fortune which enabled Czecho-Slovakia at the end of the campaign to assume the rule of a triumphant conqueror *while* imposing upon Hungary that of a defenseless victim.

"Czecho-Slovakia owes her independence in fact solely to the philanthropy of Great Britain, France, Italy and the United States, and if she has any perception of her own interests she will take care not to lose the good will of the peoples of these countries.

"The position of this post-war republic is by no means secure. In domestic affairs the mixed elements of which it is compounded—Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Germans, Moravians, Poles and Ruthenes—are so antagonistic to each other that the disappearance of the state by sudden disintegration from within is always a possibility. In this way she constitutes the powder magazine of Europe. From the report in circulation it looks as if anything may happen in Czecho-Slovakia at any time. An over-night revolution might remove her from the map of Europe as an independent state.

"One thing is certain—Czecho-Slovakia cannot continue her present policy of exploitation of her subject populations, whether they be Hungarian, Austro-German or one of the other nationalities. By doing so she will affront the public opinion of the world, and this is a risk no modern state dare incur.

"The Czecho-Slovak Government must soon make a momentous decision. Will it elect to stand upon the evasion and perversion of the Treaty of Trianon, or will it follow counsels of reason and ~ justice by saying to Hungary, We do not wish to retain within our frontiers compact blocks of Hungarian population against their will, and we agree to a revision by Plebiscite of our frontiers in this respect?

“If such a ratffication could be brought about I should recommend that Hungary reimburse Czecho-Slovakia for any money spent since the Treaty of Trianon upon the retroceded territory and for loss of employment on the part of Czecho-Slovak public functionaries, but there must be a set-off in shape of adequate compensation to Hungarian Nationals who have been wrongfully dispossessed of their properties.

“The idea of an independent Czecho-Slovakia first reached the minds of the masses of the western nations through the *Daily Mail* and its associated newspapers and I very much doubt whether, except for the publicity thus given, Czecho-Slovakia, as we know it today, would have had any existence.

“M. Masaryk, President of Czecho-Slovakia, was during the war a highly esteemed member of the staff of contributors to these papers. I am convinced that President Masaryk himself is not satisfied with the present position in regard to the Hungarian minorities in his country, for it is stated in August’s *Fortnightly Review* that in recent treatise, entitled ‘The New Europe’, he envisages a revision of the present frontiers of Czecho-Slovakia.

“I cannot do better than quote his exact words. He wrote:

‘The settlement of ethnographic boundaries after the storm of war will possibly be provisional in some cases. As soon as the nations quiet down and accept the principle of self-determination, a rectification of ethnographic boundaries and minorities will be carried out without excitement and with due consideration of all questions involved.

“I was one of those who welcomed the erection of Czecho-Slovakia into an independent State and I should be sorry to see that country forfeit the confidence which Allied nations placed in it. I realize, as every thinking man must, the standing danger to European peace of allowing Czecho-Slovakia to remain an exposed political powder magazine.

“Two years ago, I decided to draw attention to the perils of the present position, but I then determined to wait until the Treaty of Trianon had been in operation seven full years, so that whatever adjustments were essential could take place in the calm atmosphere of mature reflection.

“I have some hope the Czecho-Slovaks will see how plainly to their own interests is the course I recommend. What I claim for Hungary is no more than elementary justice. The idea of a return to her pre-war frontiers is out of the question. Hungary must pay the penalty of defeat. But that is no reason for inflicting upon her such wrongs as the war was expressly waged to abolish.

“She has a perfectly righteous and reasonable claim to recover the territory preponderantly inhabited by Hungarians which as a result of the Treaty of Trianon at present lie just across her frontiers, cut off from all intercourse with her by every device the malevolence of her neighbours can invent.

“This state of things is an outrage to an ancient and splendid people with a history of high endeavour extending over a thousand years. It is fundamentally wrong and it cannot endure. There is time now to right it peaceably and effectively. If we continue to close our eyes to the evil, it will keep alive the spirit of hatred and hostility in Central Europe, with the inevitable result of a disastrous War.

“Are we so blind as to let the elements of another terrible conflict accumulate unchecked? It is the duty of Britain, France and Italy, as the members of the League of Nations primarily responsible for the present situation, to take steps to give Hungary the relief to which she is entitled. Their generosity in this matter will not be abused. They will be dealing with a nation which, though small, has a character and traditions second to none.

“I repeat that Hungary is the natural ally of Britain, France and Italy in Central Europe. Even during the war she showed her natural good feeling toward Britain and the United States by refusing to intern her British or American residents, who were allowed to continue their usual occupations.

“She was hardly more than a technical enemy of these two countries, and she will make a loyal and reliable friend of whatever nation extends to her a helping hand in her day of emergency and distress.”

A beacon for the storm-tossed Hungarian Ship of State, Lord Rothermere, moved by a fine spirit of justice and true democracy, was the first among the powerful foreigners to take up the cause of Hungary. Through the gigantic organs of the Rothermere press, the noble Englishman was able to present the

Hungarian dilemma to the world and spread the gospel preached in his campaign of enlightenment.

17. HUNGARIANS IN AMERICA

Louis Kossuth Visit to America

The strongest ties between two nations are those of history. The recognition of one of these links between Hungary and the United States was the unveiling of the Kossuth Monument on Riverside Drive in New York City on March 15, 1928, in the presence of the distinguished delegation of the Hungarian Parliament, headed by Baron Perényi of the House of Representatives.

The Mayor of New York assigned the place for the famous bronze, of the Hungarian immortal. Seventy-seven years earlier the predecessor of the present Mayor gave the freedom of the city to Kossuth, who was the guest of the nation.

Kossuth symbolized the same ideal of a martyr to freedom as did Abraham Lincoln. Some of his addresses, delivered in this country, were incorporated in books of rhetoric. Kossuth's English was that of a man who learned it from an old English Bible while imprisoned by Austria for his work for Hungarian liberty. In the United States, streets and public buildings have been named after him; one Kossuth monument stands in Cleveland, Ohio, the second in New York.

A further link between the two nations was forged when in 1852 President Fillmore dispatched the United States frigate "Mississippi" to Kutahia, Asia Minor, to save Kossuth and his friends from Austria and Russia, the Turkish government having shown an inclination to deliver him and his followers to those two countries. Before the American battleship arrived, the British Government took measures to save Kossuth from the "justice" of Austria, the British fleet moving from Constantinople only after Kossuth and his friends were already on board the "Mississippi."[1]

1 Upon the urgent request of the British Ambassador, Sir Stratford Canning, at Constantinople, the British Government ordered Admiral Parker with British warships to take position in front of the city.

Hungarians fighting in Americas's Civil War

Kossuth's visit in America was not purely personal, as it caused a great number of Hungarian political refugees to follow him to American shores. The historical moment for the emigres came when Abraham Lincoln called all able sons of the Union to the colours to decide whether liberty or slavery should prevail in this country. Many Hungarians reported without hesitation to the flag of Lincoln. It is impossible to give the exact figures of the number of Hungarians who fought in the Union Army. One historical document of the State Department places the number of Hungarians and Austrians at 25,000; this number, however, is too high, even if we include the Slavic and German races of Hungary.

The Garibaldi Guard, attached to the 39th New York infantry, was organized by Myhalóczy, and composed mostly of Hungarians. According to official data there were in the lines of the 24th Illinois infantry about 1800 Hungarian privates and 100 officers. It is interesting to note that in this group of Hungarian officers there were two major generals, five brigadier generals, fifteen colonels, twelve lieutenant colonels, thirteen majors and many military surgeons. Colonel Gustave Wagner, previously a famous artillery staff officer in the Hungarian army, led the expedition of the Union Army to Belmontami, Lucas Bend, Missouri; and was later appointed chief of ordnance on General Fremont's staff. General Stahel commanded a whole United States army corps. Generals Knefler, Koozlay, Mundee, and General Pomucz and Colonel Zsulafsky were in command of brigades. General Asboth, a descendant of the oldest Hungarian nobility, commanded an infantry division and later a fort. He was decorated several times, and at the conclusion of the war, was appointed Minister to Argentina and Uruguay, both of which posts he held until his death in 1866. The Republic of Argentina ordered military honours at his funeral. His remains were sent back to the United States at the request of the government and were placed in the National Cemetery, at Arlington, where so many other Hungarian heroes who fought for American ideals are buried.

No effort has been made to list all the records of the Hungarian chapter of the Civil War. A more detailed account of the part played by these Hungarians may be found in "Hungarians in the American Civil War" the work of Eugene Pivány. Howard Russell, a war correspondent, describes in his "Pictures of Southern ~ Life" the chivalrous and soldierly deportment of the Hungarian

officers in the Union Army. A further account of the deeds of these men may be found in the "Story of Guard," which was written by the wife of General Fremont.

Hungarian Immigrants in the USA

It is a difficult task to determine the exact number of Hungarians living within the borders of the United States although we have official and unofficial figures recording their emigration. According to the 1930 census, there are 473,538 Hungarians in America, however, 205,426 of this figure represent the second generation, and as the process of assimilation is very rapid this generation is already more American than Hungarian Of the remaining 268,112 we should exclude those emigrants of Slovak and Rumanian stock who came to this country with Hungarian passports because they had been Hungarian subjects before the war. On the other hand, many of the post-war emigrants from Rumania, Czecho-Slovakia and Yugo-Slavia are in reality Hungarians who have become citizens of other countries since the Peace Treaty incorporated their birthplaces into the territories of neighbouring countries. We must also discriminate between Hungarians living in America and Americans of Hungarian origin. The former represent the masses of immigrants who, still clinging to their old-world traditions, choose to live in separate communities, the latter are those who have adopted the manners and customs of American life. The number of Americans of Hungarian descent who have been assimilated in the first generation may be found by a comparison of official and unofficial figures Though the official figures show that there are 268,112 first-generation Hungarian emigrants, the combined circulation of the three Hungarian daily newspapers in America is less than 70,000. This indicates that the majority of this generation of Hungarian origin have been Americanized to such an extent that they have entirely lost interest in the affairs of the Hungarian communities.

A closer analysis of the Hungarian movement to America shows two separate phases. The first influx from Hungary moved toward America after the collapse of the Hungarian revolution in 1848. This was an immigration of so-called political nature, and the men who were driven to the shores of America were emigres rather than immigrants. Former officers of the revolutionary army, ardent patriots wanted for "high treason," journalists and politicians who could no longer endure the tumult in their native land, sought asylum here; some awaiting the dawn of a better era in their native country,

many despairing of Hungary's future and eager to found new homes for themselves and their families. Many of the well-known leaders of the Hungarian revolution came thus to America during the period from 1850 to 1860 and endeavoured to eke out some kind of livelihood in a country whose language they did not speak and whose customs were new and difficult for men of advanced years and established habits. When Louis Kossuth arrived in New York in 1852, he found a small Hungarian settlement composed of his exiled followers and victims of the great political upheaval, which was the nucleus of the future Hungarian colony here.

The first wave of Hungarian immigration lost much of its force in the late sixties, when the Vienna government granted full amnesty to Hungarian political exiles, and after the compromise with Austria in 1867 it ceased altogether. From that time up to the nineties the immigration from Hungary was spasmodic. In the larger cities of the United States the Hungarian colonies, too small to support even a single daily newspaper, were absorbed largely into the American community life. Hungarian life in America centered around the few Hungarian restaurants and coffee houses in the large cities. The development of these colonies was rather slow, and their increase was only gradual, up to the beginning of this century, when America received a second influx of Hungarians.

This was an immigration of an altogether economic nature. The statistics of the folk movements between Hungary and the United States from 1908 to 1921 show their real character. These figures show that during fourteen years 57 per cent. of the Hungarian emigrants returned to their own country and only 33 per cent. remained in America. This return movement also meant that a great amount of money was transmitted by the emigrants to Hungary. It is difficult to give exact figures regarding the amount sent by these Hungarians to their own country but those available for 1900-1906 place the amount at $250 million. The approximate amount of each check amounted to $31.21 and the average amount sent each year was $41,647,000. The average Hungarian emigrant arrived in America with $16.00 in his pocket. Statistics show that 68 per cent. of them were farmers or farm hands in the old country.

There were no political emigres among the new arrivals, and the middle class was only sparsely represented in the ranks of the newcomers. Some former merchants and manufacturers who had experienced adversities in Hungary and who chose migration in preference to reestablishing themselves in their

native land came to America, but the majority consisted of former peasants who were unable to satisfy their land hunger in their native country. At this time throughout Europe the agricultural workers earned low wages and the big land owners exercised a great influence in the legislatures. The right of union and

Year	Emigration from Hungary	Returns to Hungary	Residuary Emigrants	Deportat-ions	Total Emigration
1908	24,378	29,276	(-) 4,898	65	(-) 4,963
1909	28,704	11.507	17,197	42	17,155
1910	27,302	10,533	16,769	304	16,465
1911	19,996	18,975	1,021	46	975

assembly had not been granted to the peasants; strikes and the formation of trade unions among the agricultural workers were regarded as criminal offenses. Although the economic condition of the industrial labourers and skilled workers was very much better it was still far below that of the industrial wage-earners in America. At the beginning of the century these men and women were caught by an irrepressible emigration fever, and although the Hungarian Parliament passed a law which proclaimed "persuasion and seduction to emigration," to be a criminal act, the number of immigrants increased from year to year until in 1914 it reached the startling figure of 60,000, of which number 44,000 came to the United States.

Only a small percentage of the former peasants continued in agricultural work after their arrival here. The peasant was wont to regard industrial labour as superior to that of agricultural work; moreover he associated the idea of land and farming with a permanent residence, and he had not come here with the intention of remaining. The industrial plants paid higher wages, and since his ultimate aim was to save enough money to return and buy a piece of land in the old country, he was soon transformed from an agricultural to an industrial worker.

Although he did not understand the language of the new country and had faint hope of learning it in the immediate future, he liked America immensely. He experienced the pleasant sensation of being elevated in his social status. At home, he was simply "John," "Steve" or "Say, You;" Here he was *mister*. He discarded his peasant attire; he acquired a certain amount of affluence and lived in great comfort as compared with his standard of living in the old country; he had money in the bank. He was privileged to join the various associations of his countrymen and expound his views at the meetings. The priest addressed him with respect since it was he who helped to support the Church.

The picture of the abandoned Hungarian homestead appeared to him in his dreams, and in the springtime when he toiled in the coal mine or in the sweatshop he remembered the intoxicating fragrance of young grass. The love of the home soil and this call of the fields, however, became less insistent—and he remained here. Every year a few Hungarians returned and realized their ambition by buying a farm in the very heart of Hungary, but this number grew even smaller in comparison with emigrants. Those who returned to Hungary were no longer the subdued peasants whose demands

formerly had been so few. They represented a new hardened type, conscious of their rights, and unwilling to submit themselves to the dictates of the county officials.

The majority of Hungarian immigrants chose to establish themselves permanently in the United States. The war, it is true, gave rise to a great awakening of Hungarian patriotism and in spite of American ties many returned "home" after the Armistice, determined to realize their long-cherished ambitions and buy a homestead in Hungary. The unfortunate economic conditions immediately after the war, however, drove back many of these prospective Hungarian landowners. They settled down here again, their children attended American schools, and while they kept a warm spot in their hearts for their mother country, they no longer felt like strangers in the United States.

How did the Hungarian emigrants accommodate themselves to. American conditions, and what has been their contribution to America? Here again we must discriminate between the two outstanding groups, analyzing first the achievements of the labouring masses and later the intellectual accomplishments of a few.

The majority of the Hungarian emigrants settled down in the large cities of the East and Middle West and engaged in industrial labour, mainly in the steel and automobile industries and in mining, where they became reliable and intelligent workers. The Hungarian is by nature diligent and ambitious, his standard of living is considerably higher than that of the Slavic or other Eastern European races, and his work is thorough and conscientious. He has an innate reverence for law and order. During the past seventy-five years statistics show that very few Hungarians have been sentenced for major crimes, and such minor crimes as fraud and theft are so contrary to the nature of the former peasant that they are almost unknown among Hungarian emigrants.

Though the number of intellectual and professional Hungarian emigrants who have come to this country is comparatively small we cannot gain a clear view of the achievements of the race in America without taking into account the role played by this class. In almost every professional and intellectual field Hungarian names appear among those of the leaders. In journalism the name of the late Joseph Pulitzer, a Hungarian emigrant, stands out; in the field of

medicine, Doctor Arpád Gerster was recognized as one of the leading physicians.

One does not need to possess the gift of prophecy to predict that the Hungarian influx to the American cultural fields will be greatly augmented during the years to come. We are now in the midst of a third wave of emigration, one of artists and professional people. Since the war the Hungarian lowlands have not sent their peasants and labourers to the western shores of the Atlantic, not by reason of the quota law, which has restricted the number of Hungarian emigrants, but because the peasants and labourers in Hungary have no longer reason to leave their native land in quest of greater financial possibilities, since the present Hungarian Government is providing for a better social and agricultural policy in the home country.

The war and the subsequent revolutions wrought deep changes in the social structure of Hungary, and these changes are reflected in the new type of Hungarian emigrant. The peasant became rich enough during the war to pay his debts, and was able to sell his products for gold. Even his social status has undergone a favourable change, and, with the introduction of a new right of franchise, the farmers have obtained in the legislature representation appropriate to their numerical proportion.

The Farmers' Party[2], non-existent in pre-war Hungary, is at present one of the most powerful blocs in the Hungarian Parliament. Although the situation of the skilled labour class is not in accordance with the use of the agricultural peasantry, the increased demand for workers has produced a far better balance of wages.

While the lower strata of the population in Hungary attained a certain amount of affluence during and after the war, the middle class suffered, and the intelligentsia, the leading class before the war, sank into utter poverty. Lifetime savings were lost as a result of inflation, and earning possibilities decreased or disappeared altogether. The dismemberment of pre-war Hungary played havoc with the existence of hundreds of thousands of people. The smaller Hungary was unable to support the intelligentsia as in the past.

2 Formally known as "Smallholders' Party.

Thousands of State employees were thrown out of work and an army of exiled lawyers, judges, physicians, merchants, and manufacturers, were forced to leave the lost territories.

The paupers of Hungary cannot be found among the "lower" classes, but among men who ten years ago lived in the better residential sections of the large towns and who, after many years of hard work and success, are now facing starvation. The younger generation came back from the war only to find a most desperate struggle for its daily bread. To start life anew is a possibility and an everyday occurrence in the United States but almost an impossibility in present-day Hungary. Therefore these ruined professional men of Hungary are emigrating. Physicians and engineers, lawyers and journalists, judges and merchants, professors and artists, are besieging the American Consul in Budapest for visas. This educated Magyar comes here with a considerable knowledge of the English language and with the determination to adopt American customs and American citizenship as quickly as possible. Intellectually he is greatly superior to the pre-war type of Hungarian immigrant, and he is loath to take part in the limited community life of his countrymen. In most cases he is tired of Europe and comes to this country to stay. His determination to succeed and his superior intelligence are the secrets of the speedy Americanization of this post-war type. 'When he receives his citizenship papers he is American not only legally but also in spirit.

The conscious isolation of the new Hungarian emigrant from the life and activities of the Hungarian colonies in America has a signal bearing on the future development of these "nationality islands." The quota law has dealt a blow to these emigrant communities which have thrived on the "East Side" of the large American cities during the past thirty years, and the swift pace of Americanization has tended to quicken the obliteration of native language and customs. There have always been two types of Hungarian emigrants in this country: those who went through the process of assimilation and lived as Americans and those who lived within the spiritual world of Hungaro-American communities, cut off from the main arteries of Magyar life as well as from the currents of American life.

The following incident is an illustration of the tendencies of the latter class of emigrant. One afternoon in the fall of 1923 Count Apponyi and the author, walking in one of the outlying districts of Cleveland, happened to meet a working man with whom they fell into conversation. He was asked if he spoke

English. His reply was typical. “When shall I learn the language?” he asked. “I start for work early and leave it late. I work with Hungarians, we speak Hungarian, we live a Hungarian life; only the money that we earn is American.”

This man may be taken to represent the transition period in the life of the emigrant; a necessary period, since it gives the newcomers an opportunity to adjust themselves to radically new conditions. It represents a valuable educational period for the future citizen. In changing his mode of life the unlearned emigrant receives a real schooling from his Hungarian newspapers, from his associations, his theatres and other institutions. Very often the Hungarian emigrant has been taught to read and write only after his arrival here, and the habit of reading newspapers and going to the theatre is encouraged in him during the first few years. In judging the Hungarian press here it should not be forgotten that these newspapers were cultural mediums for the emigrant, prepared him for a higher education, and influenced the speed of development in the racial communities.

There are two important Hungarian dailies in the United States. The first, *Amerikai Magyar Népszava* (the *American Hungarian Peoples Voice*, a daily paper) is published in New York City, and has a circulation of above 30,000. The other is the *Szabadság* of Cleveland. They deal with politics both of their native and their new country, and both are patriotic American papers which have been helpful in every way to their adopted country during their thirty-five years’ existence. Besides these dailies there are fifty-six weeklies or bi-weeklies published in the Hungarian language, all of which are devoted to the local affairs of Hungarian communities.

The Church and the “egylet,” the latter being the name for all benevolent and cultural societies, play an important role in the life of the Hungarian emigrant.' The appeal of the various churches is not only of a religious but also of a national character. Within the walls of his church the Magyar speaks his own language and the church organizations offer him contact with his countrymen. The priests are making a supreme effort to preserve the Hungarian language in America and to retard the complete absorption of the masses. This is a losing battle, without even a faint hope of success. There are several Hungarian societies in this country, the largest of these is the Verhovay Society, with a membership of 25,000. At the meetings of these various societies the Sons of the Magyar plains have an opportunity to get a political

education, instruction in American citizenship, as well as social intercourse with their own kind.

It is significant that these societies are now constantly losing members. It is the same sign of natural retrogression that manifests itself in the decreasing circulation of the Hungarian newspapers and the gradual disappearance of the so-called "Hungarian business." One explanation of this may be found in the quota law that has checked the flow of new life to the Hungarian colonies in America, depopulated the "nationality islands" and accelerated the process of Americanization. Every year death claims many of the older Hungarians, leaving a second generation that is thoroughly American. The few hundred who arrive here every year begin their life in the United States by reading American newspapers and patronizing American theatres. Even those who have been content with the intellectual food offered them by their Countrymen here, and who have been customers of Hungarian business, have realized that their success depends upon their ability to become American citizens as quickly as possible. Thus more and more emigrants leave the Hungarian linguistic islands for the open spaces of American life where the horizons are wider and the chances for success greater.

APPONYI IN AMERICA

In 1911, during his second visit to the United States, Count Albert Apponyi was honoured by the Congress of the United States with an invitation to address the House of Representatives of that body, on February 9. Until the outbreak of the World War, La Fayette and Louis Kossuth were the only other persons to receive such an invitation.

Address of Count Apponyi in the House of Representatives, United States Congress, February 9, 1911. (from *Congressional Record*: House, page 2222, February 9, 1911).

Recess to meet Count Apponyi.

Mr. Foster of Vermont. "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now take a recess for 15 minutes for the purpose of having presented to it Count Apponyi, former Speaker of the House of Representatives of Hungary and at present Minister of Education in that country."

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 3:55 P.M.) the House stood in recess for 15 minutes.

Count Apponyi was escorted into the Chamber, and to the Rostrum by the Speaker. (Joseph Cannon was Speaker of the House of Representatives at the time.)

The Speaker. "Members of the House of Representatives: The rapid development of our great Republic in less than 50 years has brought us an increase of population from 30,000,000 to 90,-000,000 plus, in the United States proper, stretching, as it does from ocean to ocean across what was formerly deserts, tunnelling mountains, making us, all things considered, certainly the largest of all civilized Governments, save Russia alone, and to say the least, one of the most powerful of nations. This development has come by and through the patriotism and the cooperation of the Caucasian Race. Great Britain, including Ireland and Scotland, Germany, and the low countries, France, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Poland, Austria, Hungary (applause), Italy and others have contributed and are contributing of their brawn and brain, who are coming here, to become citizens of this great Republic, and to aid us in this great development.

"It affords me today great pleasure to introduce a man with whose reputation we are acquainted, not only through multiplied thousands of his own countrymen, who have made and are making their homes here and have become our countrymen, but a man of world-wide reputation as Statesman and Legislator, who has for forty years served in the House of Representatives of Hungary (applause), who for many years was Speaker of that body, and now is not only a member of that body, but a member of the cabinet—Minister of Education—, I take great pleasure in introducing to you Count Albert Apponyi." (Prolonged applause.)

Count Apponyi: "Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House of Representatives. Highly as I feel the honour of being introduced to you, and of being allowed to address American Legislators in their own House, I shall not devote many of the few minutes that I shall enjoy that high privilege to mere effusions of thanks. I am almost overawed by the responsibilities that rest upon me for every word said and every word unsaid during these few minutes. I stand before you, Gentlemen, not as a single individual but as a

representative man, as a representative man of the Old World— before you, representatives of the New World, and when apparently, you are only kind enough to listen to a foreigner who chances to be among you, and to whom you do high honour, I know you inwardly ask yourselves: what has the Old World to say to the New World? Well Gentlemen, I think about this: You came from the Old World too. (applause) You were born under a happy star. The Old World has legacies of tradition, which are its force (strength) and its burden. When your ancestors left the Old World they were privileged to take away with them the very best of those traditions, and to leave behind, what is the burden of them. You took with you the very best thing, the very highest point of development, which the Old World had attained in those days; took with you the sound, healthy, vigorous traditions of British liberty. (applause)

"You developed them, and you adapted them to the conditions found in this new hemisphere to which you had come, and left behind what was burdensome in the traditions of the Old World.

"The oppressions, the mutual animosities and distrusts, the call for blood,—all this you were enabled to leave behind you, all this inheritance of hatred, of antagonism and animosities. (applause) Gentlemen, you feel it more keenly than I can express that this fortunate situation lays a great responsibility upon you, and if I am to speak here before you on behalf of the Old World, I say this: We, of the Old World, desiring to come out of the devouring waste of the ancient spirit of animosity and distrust, appeal to you, who, if perhaps not yet on the shore, feel already solid ground under your feet. We appeal to you for assistance to do away with the hateful legacy of hatred between men who ought to be brethren. (applause)

"This is the object of my mission in America. This is what I think the spirit of the Old World has to say to the spirit of the New World, and after having delivered you this message, let me again thank you for the high honour, which you have done to me. It appeals to me personally, but appeals to a feeling stronger still—to my feeling for my country. It was a privilege to enjoy the echo that these sentiments to which I gave expression have found in this House, because the echo came from your hearts and your minds." (Vigorous applause)

The recess having expired, the Speaker resumed the chair.

Robert Erskine Ely and the great philanthropist Andrew Carnegie had helped to make possible Count Apponyi's second visit to the United States in 1911. But 1911 and 1923 were widely separated years, with widely different national psychologies; and the author needed the cooperation of understanding friends in organizing Apponyi's third visit. In 1911 the nations of Europe were still at peace, but even in the United States in 1923 the smouldering embers of the World War were still alive in the form of propaganda. The author's work would have been futile indeed had it not been for the efforts of Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, professor in Columbia University and director of the Institute of International Education (Carnegie Foundation), and Professor Samuel McCune Lindsay of Columbia, President of the Academy of Political Science. In July, 1922, the author met Count Apponyi in Carlsbad, and there conferred with Frank Munsey, Colonel James B. MacLean, Samuel Untermyer and various Americans of importance, almost all of whom thought that it was too early for Count Apponyi to make a tour of the United States. Upon the Writer's return to this country, however, a committee of well-known men was formed with the cordial help of Professors Stephen P. Duggan and Samuel McCune Lindsay, for the purpose of inviting Count Apponyi to make an extended visit in America. This group was called the "All-American Committee," and it sent to Apponyi the following message:

New York City, May 29th, 1923.

His Excellency, Count Albert Apponyi,

Budapest, Hungary.

"My dear Count Apponyi:

"The undersigned have been organized as the Committee to invite you to visit the United States and to deliver lectures at our Universities upon subjects which you think will be interesting and instructive to American students.

"We remember with great pleasure your visit to this country in 1911, the deep impression you made upon our scholars and the happy memories which you left behind.

"We sincerely hope that you will see your way clear to come next fall and give us the benefit of your views upon the complicated situation which confronts the world today," etc.

(Signed) For the All American Committee,

Prof. Dr. STEPHEN P. DUGGAN,

Secretary

."The Committee was composed as follows: Dr. James R. Angell, President of Yale University; Brigadier-General H. H. Bandholz, United States Army; General Sir Arthur Currie, President of McGill University; John W. Davis, former Ambassador to Great Britain; General Charles G. Dawes, Vice President of the United States; Judge Victor J. Dowling of the New York Supreme Court; Prof. Dr. Stephen P. Duggan of Columbia University, Director of the Institute of International Education; Dr. Robert Erskine Ely, Director of the Civic Forum and the League for Political Educa tion; Dr. H. A. Garfield, President of Williams College; t~r. Frank Goodnow, President of Johns Hopkins University; Prof. Jacob H. Hollander of Johns Hopkins University; Dr. John G. Hibben, President of Princeton University; Otto H. Kahn, Banker; Carl Kelsey, Vice President of the American Academy of Social and Political Sciences; T. W. Lamont of J. Pierpont Morgan & Co.; Prof. Dr. Samuel McCune Lindsay of Columbia University, President of the Academy of Political Sciences; Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell, President of Harvard University; Dr. Henry N. McCracken, President of Vassar College; Col. J. B. MacLean, publisher, Toronto; Dr. Leo S. Rowe, Director of the Pan-American Union; Dr. R. Bruce Taylor, President of Queens University, Canada; Samuel Untermyer; Dr. George E. Vincent, President of the Rockefeller Foundation; Paul D. Cravath; Irving T. Bush, president of the Chamber of Commerce of New York State; and the author of this book.

In order to begin its economic reconstruction after the war and dismemberment, Hungary needed financial assistance, and the only place where it could be obtained was in the United States. But American people knew little about conditions in Hungary, so it was necessary that the case of postwar Hungary should be properly presented to them.

The following memoirs of Count Apponyi's third visit to the United States and Canada in 1923 are taken from my diary written on the long and

responsible journey. The Author believes that students of the present international relations between the conquered and victorious nations especially between the United States and Hungary, will find in this chapter much useful data.

The real case of Hungary had never been presented to the American people before Count Apponyi came to the United States and Canada in 1923. "No statesman's addresses ever before were received with more enthusiasm, with more sympathy and true admiration by the American public than those of the Great Hungarian Statesman, Count Apponyi. . . ."Of all visitors from Europe and the rest of the world, without a single exception, Count Apponyi was by far the best and exercised a magnetic and lasting influence on the American people," said Dr. Duggan.

According to the most competent authorities in the United States, he was the first statesman to throw light upon the dark channels of European diplomacy, through which not even experts could clearly see their way. The work of the secret laboratories of old diplomacy will have to be corrected by present and future generations of mankind. Recognizing this, Count Apponyi came to America and created here the first independent opinion after the World War. His brilliant addresses established a platform for the case of Hungary in America, and his altruistic and noble character, his impressive and commanding personality, established a lasting friendship between the United States and Hungary with an outlook for a rich ethical harvest in the near future.

Throughout his entire trip, the financial world listened to Count Apponyi. His words reached men of affairs, and a few months later, the League of Nations sent an American, Jeremiah Smith, Jr., to readjust Hungary's finances. Great loans followed, in spite of anti-Hungarian propaganda spread by the followers of former Socialist prime minister, Michael Károlyi. Hungary's economic reconstruction began.

The arranging of Count Apponyi's lecture tour was difficult because of widespread adverse sentiment. Antagonism towards the Central Powers was being kept alive by many agencies of the Little Entente. The succession states, who needed money desperately, opposed American sympathy for the Hungarian cause. Count Apponyi had not only to work a change in public opinion to Hungary, but also to inspire a new confidence in a former enemy

nation. This he did with a brilliant success which enlightened the American people concerning the dangerous results of the Treaty of Trianon and the question of minorities.

Count Apponyi, the guest of the All-American Committee, arrived in New York on the twenty-eighth of September 1923. At the pier, Professor Stephen P. Duggan and a delegation of the All-American Committee greeted him. The Hungarian statesman went to his hotel, where he was immediately interviewed by the New York press. The following report from the *New York Times* was reprinted by many papers throughout the country.

"Count Albert Apponyi, the Grand Old Man of Hungary with a record of fifty-three elections[3] to the Hungarian Parliament has arrived in New York to plead the cause of his country before the American people.

"In his seventy-sixth year he comes at the suggestion of the American Universities, the Institute of International Education, and the All-American Committee - . - He declares that he is here not as propagandist but to present the facts as they are and to say what he believes to be the cure for the ills of Europe, based upon his fifty years of practical diplomacy and intimate contacts with the leading statesmen of Europe for the last three generations."

Count Apponyi's first words upon his arrival, as reported by the *New York Times*, were: "European civilization lies in imminent danger of collapse, even though the Communist peril has been temporarily staved off. Hungary is the farthest outpost of civilization in Europe. At our back door lies semi-Barbarism[4].

"The condition of Eastern Europe is the key to the Continental problem, and Hungary, in turn, is the key to Eastern Europe. A pacified, contented Hungary would do much to preserve the general atmosphere of peace, which is so sadly lacking in Europe.

3 Four new elections were added after that.

4 Visionary statements in the light of what came after a few decades. [Ed.]

“I cannot say that relations are not strained with our neighbours Rumania, Czecho-Slovakia and Yugo-Slavia, which of course compose the Little Entente. It is hardly to be expected that the Magyars are not yet reconciled to the Treaty of Trianon, which took away two-thirds of our territory and handed over three million, six hundred thousand Hungarian citizens to the tender mercies of their former enemies.

“The treaty is a direct contradiction of ethnographic and geographical principles. When the Allied statesmen with the aid of the Little Entente sat down at the Conference table, psychology was sadly lacking. Ninety-eight percent of our woodlands fell into foreign hands and we were ordered to make vast deliveries of timber to Austria.

“But lest I create a false impression by these remarks, I should like to emphasize that Hungary is well aware of her responsibility in helping to maintain the tranquillity of Europe. We do not propose to rebel by armed force against the hard conditions imposed upon us, or to antagonize our neighbours by not carrying out in the spirit as well as the letter that treaty signed nearly four years ago with the Allies.

“My country recognizes indeed, that until such a time as the world recognizes the injustice done to her, nothing is to be gained by seeking to overthrow what must be. Already, we have settled many of our outstanding grievances with the Little Entente, and we are drawing closer every day to the economic and social threads which were snapped in 1914.[5]

“Hungary’s chief need is a loan, though I am no financier, and am not here with my hands outstretched for American dollars. Italy and Great Britain have already regarded very favourably financial assistance to Hungary. We need about $30 million to put us on our feet and then, once the currency and budget have been stabilized, we shall ask for further and greater sums for reconstruction work.

5 Since Apponyi's address the conditions of Hungary's relations with her neighbours have changed, I am happy to say, for the better. Commercial treaties have since been made among them.

“One of our pressing problems is the 300,000 intellectuals, who have returned to Budapest and other large Hungarian towns from the lost provinces. Life was made impossible for them in the neighbouring states and now they are thrown on the shoulders of the Government.

“The machinery of Government already creaks under top-heavy bureaucracy, which met the needs of a mighty Austro-Hungarian empire, but is crushing upon a small nation of seven and-a-half million people. Eventually, I presume, we must dismiss 75% of our Government Officials, as Austria has done, and attempt to absorb them into our Industrial life, which is beginning to recover . . .“

Apponyi’s first public speech was given on Oct. 3, 1923, at a dinner arranged in his honour by the All-American Committee in the Metropolitan Club of the City of New York. About 100 leaders in the public life of America listened to Count Apponyi’s address. The Hungarian statesman was seated between Dr. H. A. Garfield, President of Williams College and son of the late President of the United States, and Mr. T. W. Lamont, of J. Pierpont Morgan & Co. Dr. Garfield rose first, and on behalf of the All-American Committee, welcomed Count Apponyi. Professor Duggan then paid high tribute to the “Grand Old Man of Hungary.”

“While most of the evils afflicting Europe today could be traced to the outcome of the war, many of them can be traced directly to the failure of the Peace Work, which was meant to conclude it, and did not . . .“ was the gist of Apponyi’s address.

“You kindly asked me to deliver a series of lectures of the distressed state of Europe, and of my own country, which on account of its smallness, is due more to neglect than to hostility. It is a vast and complex subject I have to deal with, and I must indeed despair of being able to present it in all its aspects, because the evils that afflict Europe are manifold and intertwined with each other. The best-known feature of our present situation, speaking as a European, is economic and financial distress, chiefly located in the vanquished states, though the victors are in no satisfactory condition either. But economic distress of the deepest kind, which afflicts almost all of Europe, has its consequences in every field of economic activity. It implies an imminent danger to cultural progress, whose possibilities are diminished by the financial difficulties which scientific production is beset with. It contains

the direct menace of a social upheaval which would throw Europe into confusion like Russia's and which, should one country collapse, could easily prove contagious all over the world.

"I understand that America made sacrifices in the war to put an end to war. And that the war to be fought to the bitter end, should be followed by peace—just, fair and permanent.

"Now, if you look on the state of Europe, and if you put before yourself the question: 'Have we attained the noble aim for which so many of our best sons bled, and if you are prepared to look facts in the face, you get a melancholy answer to that question. The sort of peace that has been concluded and from the making of which America withdrew when she saw her ideals disregarded, which she has not ratified, and of which, therefore, I can speak freely before you, has not really put an end to war and warlike dispositions. It contains seeds of new conflicts because it was concluded in the heat of a persisting war like spirit, with entire disregard of facts and feelings which affect our natural laws and which will assert themselves whether we wish it or not.

"It is only natural and perfectly legitimate that after a war that caused them enormous sacrifices, the victor States should secure some advantages—great advantages, even—at the expense of the vanquished party. But there is a limit to this and the limit is laid down by the natural law of a political construction and by those of national psychology.

"Nothing which is unnatural, nothing which contradicts the principles on which the making of nations is based can permanently last; nothing, which is unbearable to permanent and indestructible feelings of great or small nations can last; and if such is the structure of the world, to disregard these natural laws of that structure implies the constant menace of a collapse and a constant danger of war.

"Some of the constructions of the Trianon Treaty are set up in direct defiance of ethnological principles, since of the ten million souls which we have lost, three million three hundred thousand -:are Magyars, quite a third part of the total number of Magyars, and 1,200,000 Germans, who have no racial connections with the neighbours to whom they have been given.."Such is the Trianon Treaty, which really looks as if it had been set up as a sort of melancholy practical joke in defiance of every law of political construction,

geography, history, ethnology, economic inter-dependence, unity of fluvial system and the natural leadership of the most cultivated race.

"What, then, is my conclusion? 'What else can it be but this: That the ultimate remedy to the evils that afflict Europe can be found only in a wholesale revision of the Peace Treaty inspired by a proper regret for the nature of things, for the war, which every nation represents as the producer and keeper of some of mankind's resources and treasures. Only then can militarism be expiated, which now exists to a frightful extent, but in some states only.

"But, though I frankly own that a radical cure for world evils is unthinkable without revision of the Peace Treaties, I am perfectly aware of the fact that the times are not yet ripe, and probably for many a year to follow will not be ripe. It would be absolutely impossible to get anything like a general agreement as to the question of revision on principle and still less in its details.

"The melancholy part of it is that there is a cure for all these evils, that it would not even be so very difficult to carry out, if economic questions were dealt with on economic, and not on political lines; but if I am to characterize the distracted state of Europe in its economical aspect I should say the common characteristic of all difficulties that besiege Europe is the adulteration of economic activity and economic problems by political hatreds, misgivings and aspirations.

"We look in Europe for somebody or someone who can lift the rulers of nations up to a higher standard of wisdom, whose influence can disentangle them from the prejudices and diffidence in which their better judgment is still implicated, someone who can lead them from the realm of a persistent war-like spirit into the regions of peace mentality; who can explain to them the lesson, which we are told by present distressing circumstances if we contrive to open our eyes to them, the lesson, which reminds us of the great law of solidity of nations as a law common to every-day material needs and other highest purposes of moral excellence."

On October 4th Apponyi appeared at a luncheon given by the New York State Chamber of Commerce. Many prominent leaders of American finance and industry were present to hear Count Apponyi assail the Treaty of Trianon. He said, "The revival of Central Europe's economical efficiency is essentially connected with a revision of those treaties which have wrought

such havoc. But Hungary knows that the time is not yet ripe to mention the idea of revision, and so confines her activities at present to the negotiation of a foreign loan upon which she may be able to balance her budget, straighten out her currency, and stimulate production, thus, giving a different aspect to her foreign trade balance." Men in the audience, whose decisions direct the financial credits of the United States, listened eagerly to the Hungarian statesman's address and frequently interrupted the speaker with applause.

On October 4th, Count Apponyi, introduced by the President of the college, addressed about two thousand students and guests of Vassar College at Poughkeepsie on the "Social Problem of Hungary." After the lecture a number of native Hungarians spoke to him about the more intimate problems of their country.

Count Apponyi addressed Cornell University on October 8th, 1923. This was his second visit to Cornell, the first having taken place during the administration of President Shurman in 1911. "The Political Situation in the Near East" was the subject on which he spoke, and since he had been the head of the Hungarian Delegation to the Peace Conference in Paris in 1919, it aroused great interest. In his introduction, President Farrand said that Apponyi was, "in more than one sense a citizen of the world." Cornell University invited the public to hear the address and there was a very large attendance.

On October 9th, Apponyi and the author arrived in Buffalo. On the following day Apponyi delivered his address, "The Social and Economic History of Hungary and its Present Outlook," at a luncheon of the Garrett Club. Mrs. Sterling Deans, the President of the Club, introduced the lecturer. During his address, Count Apponyi was disturbed for the first time. A small group of Bolsheviki of Hungarian origin had come uninvited to the club and seated themselves in the first row. After the address they noisily questioned Apponyi. Police and attendants rushed to quiet the disturbance, but Count Apponyi asked to have the agitators left where they were that he might answer them. This he did in their own language, and they then went quietly away.

In the evening Count Apponyi addressed the Saturn Club at a large dinner given in his honour by the outstanding citizens of Buffalo.

In Cleveland on October 11, where an Hungarian committee greeted Apponyi, it was gratifying to see former immigrants from Hungary who had become influential citizens in a great centre of American industry and sincere contributors to American culture, but who still kept a warm feeling for the soil where they were born. Travelling through the United States and Canada, it was with mixed feelings that Apponyi and the author observed the prosperity of their Hungarian kinsmen in the new world, and the esteem in which they were held.

In his first address in Cleveland, Count Apponyi said: "We have no intentions of using violence to obtain redress. No, we believe that an awakening of the international conscience must come sooner or later, as sure as God works among men."

The prophetic vision of Count Apponyi displayed in so many instances during his long political career was again revealed in this great prophecy. Since his memorable speeches in Cleveland and in many other American cities, the international conscience of the world, especially that of the United States of America, has indeed been awakened regarding the true situation in Central Europe.

The following editorial appeared in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* on Saturday, Oct. 13th, 1923:

"Distinguished Pleader"

"A tall, straight man with a white beard stood upon the stage of the Engineer's Auditorium Thursday night and described to a Cleveland audience the woes which years of war, and other years of peace that is not peace, have brought upon his country. With dramatic gesture and eloquent speech he told how hunger and selfishness and political expedience have torn a nation apart and left the great bulk of its people pauperized and starving.

"The white-bearded man was Count Albert Apponyi, Hungarian statesman, and former Premier. He comes, as others have come from other capitals of Europe, to ask the aid of America for his country. His story, too, is like those that others have told—of life reduced to its very elements, of profiteers in luxury and intellectuals in rags, of a race divided in the working out of peace; and, above all, of the injustice of the Treaty of Trianon.

“His plea will be repeated in many other cities, for the Count, with half a century of devoted service to Hungary behind him, still works with all his vigour for its good, and he has come overseas to plead its case before the Bar of the World’s Opinion. He makes no suggestion to America as to what form its assistance should take; that, he holds would be impertinent. But America will listen closely. The help he desires may be forthcoming eventually, or it may not. For visitors to America have brought it many variant opinions, and it has formed countless others with the aid of its own eyes. It does not really know what it should do. So its acceptance of Count Apponyi’s viewpoint is much less certain than its acceptance of himself. To the venerable statesman and patriot it extends its appreciation and good wishes in the words of the throng that met him upon his arrival in Cleveland and bade him good health and long life.” “Éljen!”

The next morning Count Apponyi and his party went to St. Elizabeth’s Cathedral, where members of the Hungarian colony had gathered to hear Apponyi. Mgr. Boehm received us at the door of the church and invited Apponyi “to enter the house - of God” calling him “the great Professor of the World.” The Organ resounded with an Hungarian tune, a thousand years old, and Count Apponyi went into the church followed by a guard of honour with drawn swords, dressed in the old uniform of the Hungarian Hussars. Later in the day Apponyi and the author called on Mr. Myron T. Herrick, the United States Ambassador to France, who happened to be in Cleveland at the time.

Next morning arriving in Chicago, Count Apponyi stepped out on the platform with youthful vigour and greeted the Hungarian delegation and American reporters who were waiting for him.

In an interview with the press, Count Apponyi said: “Germany and Central Europe can be saved from the abyss on the edge of which they are tottering. The questions there are economic, including the reparations question, and are treated solely as economic questions and separated from political considerations.

“The trouble has been that the questions affecting Central Europe have been approached as political matters. The statesman, dealing with them feel the political aspirations of their own countries and are controlled in a large measure by the feelings of their people rather than by economic facts. .

“I am absolutely pro-league, I am not satisfied with everything in the Covenant of the League or its operations. But I believe that it will develop into something highly useful. Of course a League without the United States, Germany and Russia is a lame one. .

“There is a human nature in nations. With Central Europe crushed and other nations strengthened, it is only human that the strong should take advantage of their power. So now we find Europe the victim of an acute disease, the reparation question, the economic situation.”

Later that day Count Apponyi delivered an address before the University Club of Evanston, Illinois.

The next day Count Apponyi spoke in the Presbyterian Church. He discussed the psychology and philosophy of peace treaties, and love toward mankind and its relation to the Treaty of Trianon. The congregation, which formerly had been anti-Hungarian, was deeply moved and the minister prayed for the success of Apponyi’s great work in this country and all over the world.

On October 15th the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations invited Apponyi to make an address at a luncheon. Among the many prominent men present, was General Charles G. Dawes, Vice President of the United States. After the luncheon Mr. Dawes accompanied Apponyi to the Drake Hotel, where they held a long discussion. Mr. Dawes was then working on the “Dawes Plan” and wanted to consult Apponyi on European affairs.

At a luncheon of the Chicago Association of Commerce on October 16, Count Apponyi met Lloyd George, the famous war Premier of England. When Apponyi entered the room, his tall commanding figure drew everyone’s attention. Lloyd George instantly rose from his seat and taking a few steps toward the Hungarian statesman, grasped his right hand in both of his own in a hearty welcome, crying, “Ladies and Gentlemen, I consider Count Apponyi one of the most brilliant statesmen of Europe.”

This meeting of the two prominent European statesmen was commented upon in the press all over the world.

In Toronto, Colonel J. B. MacLean and a distinguished Canadian Committee greeted Apponyi, who was the guest of Colonel MacLean at the York Club.

Public opinion in Canada was very antagonistic toward the Central Powers. But Colonel MacLean was a man of vision, and wanted to build up and not destroy the interests of civilization after the war. It was he who laid the foundations upon which Count Apponyi was able to build a sympathetic understanding between Canada and Hungary.

Upon arriving in Toronto, Colonel MacLean informed Count Apponyi that the Inter-Allied Reparation Commission had unanimously adopted the resolution requesting the League of Nations to organize Hungarian finances along lines similar to those of Austria. . . . This was to begin with a loan of $24,000,000. Count Apponyi said: "That is a great news. It is a matter of the greatest need and urgency. This move marks the turning of the tide for Hungary."

On October 18th, Apponyi addressed the Empire Club of Canada on the Social and Economic History of Hungary. The next day the Toronto *Telegram* said, "The first statesman from a country late our enemy to be the guest of Toronto's Empire Club spoke at the Club's luncheon at the King Edward Hotel yesterday. Notwithstanding his war opposition, he spoke in terms of highest praise of Canada as a great component, though self-governing part, of the magnificent British Empire." Sir Robert Falconer, the host of the author, introduced the speaker with words of praise and love for him and the Hungarian nation.

Apponyi's address was an eloquent plea for international peace. Moving a vote of thanks after Apponyi had finished, Sir John Willison spoke in terms of praise of the "candour, courage and eloquence with which Count Apponyi presented his views in a language not his own." More than a thousand people were present at the luncheon. Count Apponyi was seated between the Canadian Premier and Dr. MacNeil, the Archbishop of Toronto.

On October 19th, Apponyi's party visited the College of Upper Canada, accompanied by Colonel MacLean. Addresses were delivered by Sir Arthur Currie and Count Apponyi. In the afternoon Count Apponyi addressed the Women's University Club of Toronto.

Before Apponyi's address at the University of Toronto, Sir Robert Faiconer introduced the speaker as an apostle of truth and peace, who would make an eloquent plea in support of the League of Nations, the subject of Apponyi's

address. The next day the Toronto *Globe* described Apponyi as, "not looking his seventy-seven years, very tall, with a long white beard and a magnificent voice, which reached with ease to every part of the hail." After Apponyi had finished speaking, one of the many Hungarians of Toronto stepped forward and greeted him in the following words:

"In the name of ten thousand Hungarians in Canada, I greet you, Count Apponyi. We love the soil where we were born, but we became loyal British citizens of the Dominion and we are gad to contribute in our own humble way towards the prosperity of this adopted country of ours. But we promise never to forget the soil where we played as children and our spiritual love toward the old mother soil will always live in our hearts."

The Archbishop, Dr. MacNeil, on October 21st gave a breakfast, before which he said a mass in his house chapel in honour of Count Apponyi. Later, accompanied by Colonel MacLean, we left for Niagara Falls.

Sir Arthur Currie, who was Apponyi's host in Montreal, is now president of McGill University. The World War found him a major in the reserves. His unusual ability soon attracted the attention of the highest British commanders. At the Battle of Amiens he was made the Commanding General, and after the Armistice was made a Baronet. His work in the educational field was just as brilliant as his work in the battlefield.

Sir Arthur Currie entertained Count Apponyi at luncheon, where the most prominent men in Canadian public life were present, who were very sympathetic towards Hungary. Dr. Adams, Vice President of McGill; Sir F. William Taylor, General Manager of the Bank of Montreal; Senator Dandurand, Member of the Cabinet; G. W. McConnell; Professor B. Williams; W. Mitchell, ex-Minister; Sir Herbert Holt, President of the Royal Bank of Montreal; E. W. Beatty, President of the Canadian Pacific Railway; Colonel Boovy; Major McDonnel, General Manager of the National Trust Company; Senator White; Sir W. Meredith, President of the Bank of Montreal; Lord Shaughnessy, Chairman of the Board of the Canadian Pacific Railway; the writer of these lines; and our host, who introduced the speaker.

The present situation in the Near East was the subject of Apponyi's address given that evening in the great hall of McGill University. On October 24, the Montreal *Gazette* gave the following report:

"Placing facts and figures before his audience and not attempting to teach a lesson or even suggest what should be done to ameliorate economic and political conditions in his native country, Count Apponyi, former Speaker[6] of the Hungarian Parliament and one of the most outstanding statesmen of Europe, addressed an unusually large audience last night at McGill University. Tall, thin and erect, in spite of his seventy-seven years, Count Apponyi presented a striking figure and astounded his listeners by his remarkable command of the English language. He spoke calmly, reviving the events which have brought something like chaos to Central and Eastern Europe, and outlined the facts which he considered have helped to occasion what he termed ~distressed Europe."

Apponyi was introduced by Sir Robert Currie as the "uncompromising opponent of Communism rather than an old enemy." He said, "As a member of the government of one of the countries against which we fought, it might be thought strange to receive Count Apponyi here. But British principles are for the compassionate view and if there is any institution which will stand for the compassionate view, it is the University. As for Hungary, it is one of the countries which would have suffered if either side won. Had Germany conquered, Hungary would have been a vassal state to Berlin and if Russia had won, Pan-Slavism would have dominated in the land of the Magyars." He then briefly reviewed the political events in Hungary after the war with remarkable fairness and justice. He referred to the short-lived Károlyi Government, to Bolshevism and to Béla Kun, to the Rumanian invasion, and to King Charles' ill-fated attempt to recover the throne of Hungary.

A young Czech arose in the audience and accused Apponyi of pan-Hungarian sentiments during his office as Minister of Education. He accused the statesman of not permitting Slovak children to speak their own language in the schools.[7] Sir Arthur Currie turning toward Count Apponyi said, "I wonder, if the United States, composed of forty-eight States of heterogeneous elements and tongues, would allow any language other than English to be used in its public schools? Would any other country behave differently? Is

6 Apponyi was President of the House of Representatives of Hungary.

7 See chapter of Educational Policy of Hungary.

there any other country in the world, where there are as many races and tongues as in the United States? And how do they get along? In perfect understanding as American citizens." He then expressed his gratitude that Apponyi had come to Canada to clear away the remnants of hatred and the leftovers of war propaganda.

On October 24th, Lemieux, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Canada, and Senator Dandurand, the great Canadian statesman, called for a conference with Count Apponyi.

This was the last of Apponyi's addresses in Canada. Count Apponyi had accomplished his mission, he had formed a new public opinion in Canada sympathetic toward Hungary. He followed only one aim in the United States and Canada, and that was to place Hungary before the public in the most favourable light. He said to a group of press representatives, "Criticism of the home government of Hungary, I exercise only at home before the competent parties. Abroad, I work only for my entire country. I know only unity, concord and love."

The same night Apponyi and the author left Montreal for New York. Dr. Mezes, the President of the City College of New York, and several professors escorted Apponyi to the platform of the College auditorium. As we entered, the organist played a selection from the great Hungarian composer, Liszt. After a few words about the purpose of Count Apponyi's visit in America by Dr. Mezes, Professor Duggan introduced Count Apponyi. Quoting from the Bible, he said that no judge can judge without hearing all the interested parties of the case and if this is so for private individuals, it is also true for nations.

That afternoon at 3:30, Count Apponyi addressed the American Manufacturers' Export Association at their convention at the Waldorf-Astoria. Senator France of Maryland escorted Count Apponyi to the speaker's platform. Apponyi made a plea for the consideration of Hungary as a centre through which the West may transact business with the East, sketching the rapid economic expansion of the country in the years preceding the war and drawing in contrast a vivid picture of its present devastated economic structure. He said that Hungary, far from despairing, had redoubled her energy and was in a position to offer unique opportunities for foreign business. When he had finished, Mr. Ford, the representative of Mr. Hoover, then United States Secretary of Commerce, rose and expressed his gratitude to

Count Apponyi for his address. Then Senator France rose, spoke in condemnation of the Peace Treaties, and thanked Count Apponyi for his valuable information.

That evening Count Apponyi addressed the Lecture League of Yonkers, N. Y. The subject was, "Conditions in Central Europe Today and their Bearing on European Reconstruction." He analyzed the injustices of the Treaty of Trianon and its effects on Hungary and the safe equilibrium of Europe.

On October 27, Count Apponyi appeared at a banquet of the American Hungarian Chamber of Commerce in the Astor Hotel. There he said, "Hungary stands as a bulwark for peace. English speaking people are destined to become the greatest power in the history of the world."

On October 28, Apponyi journeyed to Washington, D. C. He expected much from this visit. He realized that a visit to the President of the United States was of the utmost importance for the reconstruction of Hungary. The entire Royal Hungarian Legation, led by Minister Count Széchényi, appeared at the station on our arrival. After several social functions Count Apponyi, accompanied by Count Széchényi, was received by President Coolidge. Count Apponyi stayed about a half-an-hour. He was the first statesman from the defeated nations of Central Europe to receive this honour. He appeared as the unofficial Ambassador of Hungary, the ambassador of peace from the defeated world.

That day Apponyi also took occasion to express to the Red Cross in Washington Hungary's gratitude for the work done there in times of distress. He also placed a wreath on the grave of the Unknown Soldier, in the name of the Unknown Soldier of Hungary.

At Georgetown University, Apponyi lectured on the present situation of Eastern Europe. The Rev. Professor John B. Creedin and several other professors escorted Apponyi to the platform. Professor Creedin then explained to the audience that Count Apponyi's purpose in coming to this country was to put before the great forum of the world the terrible sufferings and injustices caused by the Peace Treaties. When Count Apponyi had finished speaking, the Honourable William Howard Taft, former President of the United States, was the first to grasp his hand and congratulate him.

In Baltimore the Honourable Theodore Marburg, the United States ambassador to Belgium under the Taft administration, met the statesman at the station and invited us to be his house guests. In Baltimore we were interviewed by many Maryland newspapermen. That day Apponyi gave a lecture at Johns Hopkins University on the present situation in the Near East. More than twenty-five hundred students, educators and citizens were present.

Count Apponyi's next address was delivered at the Maryland Club of Baltimore at a dinner given by Dr. Frank Goodnow, President of Johns Hopkins University.

The next day the party arrived in New York City and Apponyi was again interviewed by the New York press. In the evening the professors of Columbia University gave a dinner for Apponyi in the fraternity club rooms of the University.

When he entered, wearing the Order of the Golden Fleece, the audience greeted the distinguished speaker who, as Minister of Education in the Hungarian pre-war Cabinets, had advocated progress in arts and sciences. Apponyi spoke for about an hour and a half on the psychology of the history of individuals and nations.

November 5th was a day of rest. Count Apponyi and his daughter spent the day at the author's house. For a while the great statesman forgot politics and sitting at the piano played beautiful Hungarian music.

New Haven was the next destination of Count Apponyi, and we paid a Visit to the League of Hungarian Citizens of Connecticut. Many thousands of people were invited. Professors Fisher and Farnum of Yale University and Congressman Tilson also spoke at the meeting. The New Haven *Union* commented editorially as follows:

"It is unfortunate that every citizen of New Haven could not have heard the able and truly statesman-like addresses of Count Apponyi at the Hotel Garde yesterday. The distinguished guest of the League of Hungarian Citizens of Connecticut presented an unanswerable argument against the present partition of Hungary. For economic, racial and cultural reasons he contended that the pre-war boundaries of Hungary should be restored—at least that peoples ruthlessly severed by the terms of the Peace Treaty, should have the

right by a fair plebiscite to determine whether they wanted to remain with Hungary, or pursue their destiny outside of it. Count Apponyi's plea for a more direct and active participation of America in the affairs of Europe did not fall on fallow soil. It occasioned a frank expression of sympathy, and encouragement from such able students of international problems as Professors Fisher and Farnum of Yale University. Professor Fisher felt that America should play its proper part in either the present League of Nations, or some League of similar character. He felt that the high idealism that prompted the United States' participation in the World War demanded it. This occasioned rather hot and uncalled-for rejoinder from Congressman Tilson who contended, indeed, in view of the fact that Hungary, itself, is a member of the League of Nations, and not likely to join an association so unamicable to its proposed desires, and also in view of the fact that the League Covenant imposes no such restraint upon the rectification of National boundary lines. Indeed, the more we hear partisans, like Colonel Tilson, attempt to discuss the League Covenant, the more convinced we are that either they have never read it, or having read it, have not understood it."

On Novmber 6th Apponyi started a tour of the Universities and colleges of Massachusetts. His first engagement was at Wcllesley College. On the train Count Apponyi was in a sad mood and turning to the author said, "This is probably my last visit to the United States, a country I love dearly. It is better to retire at a moment when you are still able to leave a pleasant memory with the public. It would be a terrible thing to remain so long that appearance and speech would be tolerated only for the merits of the past." The subject of Apponyi's address was "The Economic and Social History of Hungary." The next morning, columns of interviews appeared in the Massachusetts papers.

On November 8th, Apponyi spoke at Amherst College on Hungarian conditions and their relation to the rest of Europe. Professor George D. Olds introduced him to a large audience, which a pouring rain had not discouraged.

An hour later we motored to Smith College at Northampton. There we dined with Professor Sidney B. Fay, the historian. We discussed his book, "The History of Central Europe," which he was then finishing.

In the large Gothic Hall of Smith College, President Neilson asked a young student to introduce Count Apponyi. We were astonished to find how well

this young girl understood foreign affairs and international relations. She spoke with intelligence and conviction.

Apponyi returned that night to New York, where he addressed the New York League for Political Education at Town Hall on "Hungary and the Peace of Europe." After the address there was vigorous applause and many distinguished Americans expressed their sincere hope that Hungary would soon be reconstructed and the peace treaties, which were not in accordance with the American spirit or French promises, would be revised.

At noon Adolph S. Ochs, the publisher of the *New York Times*, gave a luncheon in the *Times* Building in honour of Apponyi.

That evening Count Apponyi addressed the Council of Foreign Relations of New York City at their annual dinner. Hamilton Fish Armstrong, Managing Editor of *Foreign Affairs*, ushered Count Apponyi, the guest of honour, to dinner. Professor Pupin, the distinguished Hungarian-born Serbian scientist, was also present. The Council invited many men of science, economics, finance and all the representatives of the Little Entente to debate with Apponyi, who was to be the last to speak.

John W. Davis, former American Ambassador to Great Britain, and Presidential candidate, presided and spoke with warm words of the difficult mission of the Hungarian statesman. The first speaker was Professor Isaiah Bowman, the American authority on geography. He defended the Treaty of Trianon as an attempt to solve a difficult problem. He said that enough energy had been expended in attacking it to establish a new solar system. "Too much was expected," he said, and just as Utopia was anticipated following the war, some people thought that the $100,000 Bok Peace Plan Contest would bring forth some plan to settle the menace of world conflicts. No such thing should be expected." He spoke of the work, which he and his Little Entente and French colleagues did during the drafting of the peace treaties in establishing boundaries for New Central Europe and Hungary. He did not agree with the opinions of Viscounts Bryce and Rothermere, voiced in the British Parliament.

When Dr. Bowman had finished speaking, John W. Davis said, "Whatever their disagreements or international relations, all Americans realize that the lands on the other side of the Ocean are inhabited by human beings."

Dr. Bowman was followed by Mr. Walter C. Hines, former high commissioner on the Danube. When he had finished, Apponyi spoke on Hungary and her neighbours. He analyzed all the political questions, giving convincing answers to Mr. Hines and Dr. Bowman.

Instead of the Czecho-Slovakian Minister, Dr. Stepanek, Mr. Davis asked Professor Pupin to say a few words. Dr. Pupin proved to be an able and interesting speaker. He described his childhood with bitterness. Born in Ecska, Banat (pre-war Hungary) he was sent to an Hungarian School. His father was a farmer and took him on his wagon to all the neighbouring market places. "I loved everybody. We called our neighbours 'comsier,' meaning dear brother." But his father died, and the Hungarian boys maltreated him at school. His relatives had been persecuted by the Hungarian authorities and, as he was not inclined to tolerate this persecution, he emigrated to America when he was thirteen. "I worked, I learned, and I believe I have become a good citizen of this land of love and understanding and a useful member of this great Republic. Tens of thousands of my *'comsiers'* have since come to this country. They all live in peace and prosperity in this country of brotherly love." He criticized the attitude of the privileged classes in pre-war Hungary. "Not the Western or Eastern culture are needed, Sir," he said, turning to Apponyi, "but the love of heart, the sincere understanding of mankind and humanity, is needed there and everywhere on the globe. The Magyars dominated the Empire made up of many races. They had the revenues and spent it, for the most part, on their universities and museums. Such were the conditions there, when I came to America. Hungary was too powerful. Austria was too powerful. They destroyed themselves."

Turning to Dr. Pupin, Apponyi then said, "Why could I not be just as good a democrat as you are, Sir, even though I was born a Count and a member of what you call the privileged class? Why is it only the privilege of your class to be democratic? Why could I not have sufficient love for my countrymen, even if I am a Count? Why could I not fight for human liberty and democratic institutions? Sir, as you were born in Hungary and once were an Hungarian citizen, you know quite well, that duri~g my fifty-three years in politics, I was opposed to various governments, and that I always fought for true democracy in the Hungarian Parliament. Every child in Hungary knows this. You draw an impressive picture of your childhood, but that is a personal matter and cannot be used in political arguments."

The time of Apponyi's scheduled departure arrived. His tour had changed the American spirit regarding the war, and convinced the people of the danger of present conditions in Europe.

In a statement to the press Apponyi said:

"I come from a so-called defeated country, from a country of suffering and need, and I came to arouse the public interest of the United States and Canada toward my native land. I can say, wherever I was, wherever I went and wherever I spoke, either before universities or before Chambers of Commerce or politicians, or clubs or private individuals, I found everywhere the greatest sympathy and interest for my country and myself. Not one single person in this country ever made me feel that I am the son of a defeated country. . . ."

Apponyi delivered his final address in the Town Hall. It was characteristic of Apponyi, that he made one of his best addresses without having previously prepared it. On the way to Town Hall, he discussed the subject of the speech with the author, and decided that it should analyze the various Peace Treaties of history and their political, philosophical and psychological results.

Judge Alton B. Parker introduced Count Apponyi, who first gave his impressions of America and expressed appreciation for the spirit of magnanimity toward one whose country had been an enemy in the World War.

"Never during my visit to your shores have I been made to feel that I was an ex-enemy. Here I found an atmosphere of reconciliation, of oblivion to antagonism, of a willingness to do away with bitter animosities and a desire to preserve only the memory of the glory and the self-devotion of the children of my nation, who had fought in good faith."

Analyzing European conditions, he referred to the great danger that Lloyd George found democracies to be facing, and offered his own remedy for the situation. Departing from his fundamental message, that his own country must be stable if Europe is to be stable, he said: "I could not fail to be impressed by the welcome accorded Mr. David Lloyd George and by the thought of the gigantic power which the English-speaking people, standing together, might have—a power which I, standing outside, do not dread, but welcome.

“I welcome it, because I believe that it guarantees a better spirit in the world progress toward perfect peace, and also because you are so great that you can be involved in no international trouble which does not become a world problem. And I welcome this because of your fairness. The English-speaking peoples have the best qualifications for fitting their national problems into the general problems of humanity.

“Lloyd George proclaimed danger to democracy—he saw dictatorships rising. I have for this symptom of moral distress an explanation, and I see a remedy. The new democracies, which do not rest upon traditions, upon a long past, are overburdened with responsibilities that are hard to bear, therefore they cannot lead a life of safety.

“The lesson of your democracy of the old English spirit, which you have inherited, and given fuller meaning, a spirit of fairness, mixed with goodness, must be transmitted to the life of Europe. It is not only advice and moral support, or even interference in practical, material matters, that Europe needs from you, but it is the infusion of your spirit.”

Apponyi said that he was in accord with the suggestion of a coalition between the two English-speaking democracies and France, provided they did not remain isolated.

“It is impossible,” he said, “to create Government by the people, against the will of the people.

“If these countries adopt a policy of isolation it would mean violation of treaties and it would mean cooperation against us, which would never do. If the power of such coalition is to be felt, not in the way of menace but in the way of a spiritual propaganda for good will, it must have the support of other democracies of the world too. With this inclusion, I see great promise opening up to my country, which has for centuries been the centre of liberal democracy. Hungary is the country that can join in assisting the world.

“Kindliness and power are my main impressions of America, after extensive travel and much contact with Americans.

“It is not the power, greatness, might and overwhelmingly gigantic proportions of your Commonwealth that have impressed me most, but your

kindness, goodness, spirit of love. From America came the first revival of kindness following the war. I mean the relief for the suffering in ex-enemy states, for mothers and children, the ailing poor. Because of disorganized currency, and many other difficulties, all the relief organizations that I know in Central Europe would have been forced to close their doors, but for assistance from America. Millions were spent for us by the great American heart, and the organizations through which it found expression.

"And when I came to this country I was received with kindness, which I shall always gratefully remember. Never was I made to feel that I belonged to an ex-enemy state. Here I have found a spirit of reconciliation and a willingness to do away with bitter memories."

Developing his view that undue exercise of material power invariably leads to self-destruction, Count Apponyi cited Napoleon III. and the German Military policy in 1871 as examples. To them, he contrasted Lincoln, who after the Civil War showed the people how to make an honest and sincere peace without humiliation. General Grant did not accept the sword, which Lee delivered to him as a symbol of defeat, nor the horses of the Southern cavalry. Instead he clasped Lee's right hand, and said that there were many farms in the South where the horses would be useful.

In closing, Count Apponyi proclaimed a growing faith in the idealism which in application takes account of actualities. Irving T. Bush bade Apponyi farewell and people rushed from the audience, clasped his hands and expressed warm sympathy for Hungary. Thousands of his countrymen waited outside Town Hall.

Following is his farewell message to the Hungarians in America:

"On the eve of my departure, I feel the necessity of saying a few words to the hundreds of thousands of Hungarians in America. In bidding goodbye to my Hungarian brethren living in this country, which brethren of mine followed with so much tact and sympathy my long journey in the United States and Canada, I give the following account of my experiences.

"On the whole I can state that my experiences were favourable. I came to America with the idea that the American people might not be interested in the

affairs of Hungary, and for this reason laid down the structure of my addresses on broader grounds.

"I prepared addresses on Europe and Central Europe, but soon I discovered with true pleasure that the American people wished to know the absolute truth about the case of Hungary, and demanded from me expressly that I furnish all possible information about our homeland—Hungary.

"In the term 'The case of Hungary' I never understood anything else but the relations of Hungary towards the politics of the world, the destiny of Hungary in world politics in reference to her justified hopes of revising the Peace Treaties. I refused permanently to make any criticism or statement about the internal politics of my country, and I emphasized at each occasion that home politics are home questions, which can and shall interest us at home within the boundary of the country. Regarding these problems, we maintain one wish and one principle only: not to accept a foreign interference.

"During my address I felt closely how Hungary stepped forward day by day, which was the most inward wish of my soul. Always in connection with the problems of the world.

"My chief task has been to crystallize this thought in the public opinion of America: that the problems of Hungary shall not be neglected, that the question of Hungary is not a question of local character.

"On account of the geographical location of the Hungarian race, her cultural place and destiny in the great world, which she alone is able to settle, are important factors in the reconstruction of Europe and the world. These facts the Peace Treaties did not settle. I am glad to tell you that the analytical addresses I gave found understanding and often sympathy in those distinguished American audiences whom I had the privilege to address. Truly, I did not expect the great sympathy I found towards our country in spite of the great disorientation of the American people at large.

"There is also a tangible platform, on which we can build, on the way to the final moral understanding, and the great task of an economical support to this great nation.

“Because I never neglected to speak also about the economical and business questions of Hungary, especially before such American audiences as were of the business world, for example the New York State Chamber of Commerce and the American Association of Manufacturers, I always tried to picture to the best of my abilities those Hungarian business possibilities, available in Budapest and all Hungary—for the entire Near East—for the West European and foreign trade. Fortunately there were always one or two in each of those audiences, who were familiar with the Hungarian business methods, and who endorsed my statements instantly, according to their own personal experiences in Hungary.

“Summing up, I thank the Lord for leading me to America and supporting me here. I expressed also my deeply felt gratitude to the All American Committee, composed of outstanding men of this country, which invited me to these shores. My work was not dedicated on this occasion to my Hungarian countrymen living in America, but to the public opinion of non-Hungarian origin. But this statement does not say that I have not felt the warmth of the Hungarian sympathies accompanying me throughout in this country. I felt this sympathy very much indeed, and for this reason I will leave the Continuation of my work to my Hungarian brethren.“To continue this legacy on the ground of the principles which I advocated in my addresses in the United States of America and Canada, and to eliminate any Criticism of the Interior Problems of Hungary, in intercourse with strangers. And should they ask you if the principles of this great Republic are recognized in our country, those principles which could be applied in any form of Constitutional Government, answer calmly: ‘yes’.

“Great catastrophes, almost destroying our entire national life, overshadowed perhaps temporarily those great principles I speak of, but the American people can rest assured that those principles have been imbibed through centuries in the sacred legacies of the Hungarian Constitution. These great American principles are championed in Hungary. We have plenty of fighters for this purpose in the front ranks, and the more sympathy and protection we gain in this arch-country of true democracy the sooner will those principles be fully triumphant in our country.

“Not the personal friendship—but objective fairness prompts me to state (although I had no official mission and I am not responsible to anybody but myself alone for all that I am now doing and have done) that benevolent

influence and prestige I felt on all occasions in the United States gained and established by the diplomatic representative of our country, a prestige far higher than the power of our material situation could ask for. I am so glad to endorse these facts, although I am not an adherent to the present Hungarian Home Government, but in spite of these facts, I am glad to be able to make these statements, because I never look upon my duties in the opposition in a way to attack the Government outside of Hungary. On the contrary, it was, and it is my inward desire that the Government which is entrusted with representing the prestige and interests of Hungary towards foreign countries shall be honoured and well thought of, and that the diplomatic representatives of our Government shall be able to fulfill with success their great duties and tasks. I personally observe with great pleasure that this is as stated above.

"In these principles I sum up my experience in this great country as a message to our Hungarian brethren, to whom I send through these lines my warm and never failing sympathy and greetings."

With this farewell message of the statesman to the many hundred thousands of Hungarian origin in America, appeared also a farewell message to the American people which was published in the *New York Times,* and later by the entire American press. This great message reads:

"COUNT APPONYI'S FAREWELL MESSAGE"

"What in his opinion is wrong with the Peace Treaties, and why they should be enforced as liberally as possible.

"To the Editor of the *New York Times:*

"Before leaving America, may I claim the hospitality of your columns to put into clear evidence the subject of my visit, the international program of my own country, which I tried to explain to numerous audiences, but which I should like to be understood, too, by those more numerous still whom my spoken words could not reach?

"I openly and severely criticized the Peace Treaties, more especially the Trianon Treaty, as not having fulfilled the object for which America took arms: to give to the world a peace, permanent and secure. I pointed out that the situation of Europe is more unsafe, that there are more possibilities of

conflict than were given by the pre-war constructions, because the new ones, arbitrarily invented without regard to the will of the people concerned, do still less correspond to natural laws than the former ones did. I concluded that the work of peace is still to be done, that, in due time, a revision of the treaties will prove a necessity. But I added that times are not yet ripe for this, that it is not a problem of the present practical politics, that the actual program can have no other basis than the existing treaties.

"I may as well quote the words of my first address on this subject, lest I should be charged with having been frightened by certain criticisms into abandoning my original position, I said:

"'But, though I frankly own to the conviction that a radical cure of the world evils is unthinkable without revision of the peace treaties, I am perfectly aware of the fact that the times are not yet ripe and probably for many a year to follow will not be ripe, even for a mention of that solution. It would be more than human, if those who framed the peace treaties should be ready to confess to their failure so few years after their conclusion. It would be absolutely impossible to get anything like a general agreement as to the question of revision on principle and still less in its details. Raised as a practical problem now, it would only lead to imminent conflicts and entangle matters still more than they are already entangled. So I have to point out that ultimate aim, but at the same time I disclaim every intention to deal with it as with an immediate aim.

"'For a long time to come we have to put up with such evils as cannot be remedied radically without attacking Peace Treaties, and we have to find palliatives and soporifics which make life bearable, and pave the way to that better understanding between nations which is the condition of radical peace work of any sort. We have, therefore, to consider the evils afflicting Europe and the remedies which can be applied to them within the limits of the given situation.

"'We Hungarians, more especially, openly disclaim any intention whatsoever to use violent means for the subversion of existing treaties. We trust time and experience to pave the way to a peaceful solution of the problems they have created. What we claim, until then, is only so much—that the very few clauses of those same treaties which contain something in our favour, should be executed with the same stringency expected from us in the execution of

burdensome ones. And what we expect, more, is that the obligation to observe the treaties should be equal for all nations, that there should not be any nation who can dispense with it, more especially with regard to those treaties concerning the protection of minorities, which are our only safeguard against the dissection of much of our racial substance.

"I have not much to add to these words. I have only to complete them by stating that the non-enforced enactment of the peace treaties on the fair execution of which we insist, as we certainly have the right to do, are chiefly these: Minority protection, an open way to the sea, self-Government of Székelys and Hungarians in Transylvania and Ukrainians in Czecho-Slovakia, efficient activity of the International River Commission, general disarmament. We may add our wish to establish regular economic relations with the neighbour states.

"I do not see how or on what grounds this program can be objected to. Certainly not on account of our—let us say for the present—theoretical standpoint concerning the Peace Treaties. It is in case we should declare ourselves satisfied with them that we could indeed be considered as suspicious characters, because that would be a manifest lie, which it would be impossible for anyone who knows something of national psychology to believe.

"That was the position I took, and, though not on a mission, though not in possession of a mandate, I can boldly assert to be with respect to the above statements, the spokesman of the enormous majority of the Hungarian people.

"ALBERT APPONYI. New York, Nov. 12, 1923.

Professor Stephen Duggan, director of the Carnegie Institute for International Education wrote the following preface to another book of the author's, *"Apponyi and America"* (1925):

"The visit of Count Albert Apponyi to the United States in 1923 was a veritable triumph. From the time he landed in New York City on September 28th, 1923, until he sailed again from the same port on November 13th, 1923, after having travelled over a large part of the United States and Canada, he was greeted everywhere by admiring crowds, anxious to hear his message.

“Certainly he was as smiling and full of vim, and his final speech at the Town Hall the night before he sailed was a masterpiece.

“His triumph was the result of a number of causes. The first was his own personality. Count Apponyi has a noble presence, erect and commanding, he attracts attention at once, and his benign appearance is equalled by his cordial attitude towards visitors and inquirers. The second cause of his great success was the message he brought. He did not hesitate to point out the evil conditions of his own country resulting from the Treaty of Tnanon, but emphasized the importance of basing a revision of the treaty upon a policy of conference, instead of upon force. The third factor in his success was the receptive attitude of the American people.

“Due to the fact that their attention for a century has been directed to the development of their great natural resources, they were in comparative ignorance of international affairs, especially of the affairs of Central and Eastern Europe.

“It was a great advantage to have a man of Count Apponyi’s great ability and wide experience explain to them the problems that confront that section of Europe. It was especially fortunate that this message was delivered so largely to university audiences, for the students who heard him were those who will control the destinies of the United States in years immediately before us.

“The Institute of International Education exists to develop international good will by means of educational agencies. One of the most successful ways of realizing this aim is to circuit distinguished educators and men of affairs among the institutions of higher learning. With no one was its success more pronounced than with Count Apponyi. As Director of the Institute, I am gratified to have been the instrument by means of which so many Americans were enabled to hear him.

“However, his work was much facilitated by the efforts of Dr. Imre de Jósika-Herczeg, who accompanied him throughout the entire tour and who is, therefore, best qualified to speak of its successful nature. I commend, therefore, these pages to the attention of all people interested in the itinerary of an embassador of good-will from Hungary to the United States.

Count Apponyi himself wrote:

Hungarian Society of Foreign Affairs,

and for the League of Nations

Parliament, Budapest

Honourable Sir:

The Hungarian Society of Foreign Affairs, and for the League of Nations, wishes to express its deepest appreciation of the great and altruistic accomplishments of your Honour, effected for so many years in the interest of the Hungarians in America as well as for the home country. The aforesaid Institution expresses also its deepest gratitude for the valuable services you rendered during the long visit of its President in the United States of America and Canada in 1923, in helping to present to the American people the cause of Hungary, by interpreting the unheard-of injustices against that nation. And emphasizing also your helpful tact, I am taking great pleasure in informing you of your election as an Honorary Member of the aforesaid Institution.

With highest regards,

Faithfully yours,

(corporate seal)Count ALBERT APPONYI M.P.

President.

Budapest, Feb. 16, 1924

The steamship "Aquitania" sailed on November 13th. A delegation of the All-American Committee appeared at the pier to bid Count Apponyi farewell, and to thank him for his historic work in this country. Several Hungarian deputations came to deliver the message of the Hungarians in America. Our diplomatic representatives also came to salute the statesman. Turning to the author at the last moment and clasping his hands Count Apponyi expressed time and again his deeply felt gratitude for all that was done in organizing his triumphant visit to the United States and Canada.

Hungarian Statesman Count Albert Apponyi (1846 - 1933)

18. REVISION AND REVISIONISM

Revision of the Peace Treaty

The creation of the League of Nations is to be welcomed by every student of international affairs, primarily because it has the potentialities of preventing war, at least the League of Nations can put considerable obstacles in the way of any warfare which is against the interests of humanity. Technical superiority will decide modern warfare and not the amount of troops.

Baron Julius Wlassics, President of the Hungarian House of Lords, who is one of the highly esteemed authorities on international law and arbitration and who is one of the great international jurists of Europe, says in his "Legal Amendment of the Treaty of Trianon through the League of Nations and Arbitration" ("*Justice for Hungary*" p. 291): "It would have been hardly possible to draft the Covenant more defectively. The original draft, which was not adopted, was a much better piece of work. This was prepared by Lord Phillimore, in conjunction with Mr. Taft, the former President of the U.S.A. and Mr. Elihu Root, the most distinguished international jurist of North America. We know now exactly how the work 'was done in the Sub-Committee appointed for the purpose. Small wonder then that the wording should have been so careless that any bill of secondary importance would need to be more precisely formulated than was the epoch-making Covenant."

George Lukacs, M.P.P.C., late Minister of Education, says in the same book, "Justice for Hungary," p. 143, "that the restoration of historic Hungary can alone satisfy the needs of the population and secure the interests of Europe, of civilization and even the nations who are under the fatal delusion that the impoverishment of Hungary means their own enrichment. Neither public interest nor international justice offers any ground for the partition of Hungary."

Lansing, the late Secretary of State under Wilson during the World War who next to Wilson ought to have exercised the greatest power as an American Statesman at the Peace Conferences, says in his "*Peace Negotiations,*" p. 264, "It must be admitted in honesty that the League is an instrument of the mighty to check the normal growth of national power and national aspirations

among those who have been rendered impotent by defait. Examine the Treaty and you will find peoples delivered against their will, into the hands of those whom they hate while their economic resources are torn from them and given to others. Resentment and bitterness, if not desperations are bound to be the consequences. It may be years, before these oppressed peoples are able to throw off their yoke, but as sure as day follows night, the time will come, when they will make the effort."

Woodrow Wilson, the great war president, left the U.S. on December 4, 1918, on board the steamship, "George Washington." The defeated people of Central Europe expected him and his fourteen points with heart aching anxiety. But those fourteen points were destined to become the greatest fiasco of world history. Four men decided upon the destiny of new Europe, Wilson, Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and Orlando. Wilson and Lloyd George understood only English, Orlando, French and Italian, and only Clemenceau spoke fluently English and French, which assured him from the very start a good deal of hegemony over his colleagues. How the highest tribunal, history, will laugh at this joke of four men working to create peace for war-satiated Europe practically not understanding each other's language, and speaking only through interpreters, needs no further explanation.

And how the dead cries and agonies will resound in this tribunal created for peace! . .

Added to this, Wilson was absolutely inexperienced in European affairs, had absolutely no knowledge of the psychology of the European masses, and is described by contemporary historians as "slow and theoretic, difficult and stubborn, who never wanted to hear and understand details which were extremely important in those decisions, and who dwelt only in the supreme regions of state affairs."

No one can doubt that he came to Europe with the best intentions, but he lacked the superior and dominant qualities essential in dealing with such vital affairs of history. He was shortsighted in his self-deceiving puritan way, and at the end he lent his great name as the signatory of one of the most hideous frauds in history. As man and statesman among the four, undoubtedly Lloyd George was the greatest, but unfortunately for Hungary, he was primarily interested in the affairs of his own country.

The great English publicist, J. L. Garvin writes, "The crowning tragedy of the peace was America's withdrawal and the crowning tragedy for small Hungary was the misrepresentation of Mr. Wilson's fourteen points by the peace conference." (Page 161, "*These Eventful Years.*")

"There is only one thing stranger than the cause of justice," continues Garvin, "which nourishes in beaten and despoiled men, through their darkest years, an inextinguishable potency of ultimate revolt against wrong. The renewed menace of competitive armaments and the lessening securities for enduring and confident peace, are problems which can not be solved unless some means can be contrived for revising the peace treaties of 1919, which showed the Dragon-teeth, already springing up as armed men in myriads—Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary, cannot be permanently content with their present bounds. This is not the place to consider details of rectification, but all these nations must either be placed by consent in a more bearable position or, in the long run they will strike for it."

The revision of the Treaty of Trianon must be undertaken without delay, if peace is to be made permanent. 'When he was in the United States and Canada in 1923, Count Apponyi emphasized this idea, and by his enlightenment campaign, gave an impetus to the revisionist movement which has since been advanced by historical researches in America and Europe.

Lord Rothermere, the brother of the late Lord Northcliffe, an acknowledged leader of English public life, a man who lost two promising sons on the battlefields of the 'war against the Central Powers and so against Hungary, rose to the supreme height of idealism to fight for the rights of small and oppressed Hungary.

Independent of his action, a parliamentary committee was formed in the British Parliament, composed of members of the two houses, to investigate the necessity of the revision of the Treaty of Trianon. The committee found that such a revision was urgent in the interest of the peace of Europe. This committee included members of the Labour, Liberal, and Conservative parties and aimed to secure justice for Hungary by restoring to her those territories to which she is entitled.

The British Parliamentary Committee was composed as follows: Esmond Cecil Harmsworth, M.P.; Lord Charnwood, late Secretary of State for

Agriculture; Lord Fermoy, M.P.; Lord Phillimore, former Lord Chief Justice; Lord Newton, former Secretary of State; General Lord Thompson, former Secretary of State of Air; Sir Robert Gower, Private Secretary to Premier Baldwin; Prof. Sir Henry Slesser, M.P.; Sir Patrick Ford, M.P.; Col. Sir Walter de Frece, M.P.; J. G. Tom, M.P.; J. H. Thomas, M.P.; Ex-Secretary of State for the Colonies; Windsor-Clive, M.P.; George Pilcher, M.P.; A. N. Sandeman, M.P.; E. T. Campbell, M.P.; Roy Bird, M.P.; Lord Denbigh; Lord Aberconway; Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, etc.

It is known today that at the time of the armistice even France did not wish to dismember Hungary to the extent done by the Treaty of Trianon. Mr. Milan Hodzsa, the representative of Czecho-Slovakia, spoke at the armistice conferences of frontiers which were much larger than the present territories of Hungary. If the representative of Slovakia, respectively of Czecho-Slovakia, admitted the right of Hungary to those larger territories, the Peace Treaty of Trianon ought to have been revised.

An important literature developed since the injustices of the Treaties created after the World War. The literature for revision of these treaties is called "Revisionism." Today we have plenty of authentic and fully creditable material collected by famous revisionists or research historians, which plainly reveals even to foreigners the impossibilities of the intolerable peace of Trianon.

A well-known American historian, Prof. Harry Elmer Barnes, a leading authority on revisionism, wrote in the August, 1927, issue of the *Current History Magazine*: "If Caillaux, late Premier of France (who was exiled by Poincaré because he opposed the war), had been Premier of France in 1914; if the murdered Hungarian Premier, Count Tisza, had been the Minister of Foreign Affairs for Austria and Hungary at that date; if the Russian Kokovstov had been Minister of Foreign Affairs at St. Petersburg; and Lord Morley, or the Earl of Loreburn, had been the Secretary of State in 1914, the World War would never have happened." Other American Revisionists are the famous historian of Smith College, Professor Sidney Bradshaw Fay; Miss Edith Durham and Dr. Powell.

Another distinguished revisionist in the United States is Senator Robert L. Owen, who recently published "The Russian Imperial Conspiracy," with the following dedication: "To the Fathers and Mothers and to the youth of France

and of Germany, and of the World; To all lovers of truth and fair play this volume is dedicated with the friendly suggestion that a glorious life in peace is better than a glorious death in battle."

General Dobrorolski declared that war was definitely determined on July 25. Pashitch, Serbian Premier, stated July 31 that the Russian peace negotiations were merely to conceal war. The Russian General Palizyn confirmed Pashitch. In 1916 Sazonoff admitted that the World War was brought on in 1914 by the determination of Russia to humiliate Germany.

Colonel E. M. House wrote to the President of the United States, from Europe, May 29, 1914 (House II. 248): "Whenever England consents, France and Russia will close in on Germany and Austria." (Presumably Col. House did not think of or consider Hungary in spite of the fact that she was the "bone of contention" for imperial Russian politics.)

It is quite interesting to note that much literature is being produced in France concerning the revision of the Trianon Treaty. George Demartial, author of the "L'Evangile du Quai D'Orsay," mercilessly exposes the lies of the French "*Yellow Book*." Other French writers championing revision are: Victor Margeurite, who assails French and Russian diplomacy in "*Les Criminels*"; Alfred Fabre-Luce, the author of "*La Victoire*"; E. Judet; Alcid Ebray who wrote "A Frenchman looks at peace—1927—"; Barbusse and Baron Boudran. Charles Tisseyre, a late representative of the French Chamber of Deputies in his work *"La Hongrie Mutilée. Une Erreur Diplomatique*," says "Mutilated Hungary bears the permanent disquietness in herself regarding the peace of Europe." In a recent interview, the author said that he could only add to his book published six years ago, that the French political leaders apparently had not learned sufficient from the past. William L. Langer, the prominent historian, writes in the *Political Science Quarterly*, page 656, December 1927 (official organ of the Academy of Political Science), reviewing the latest work of Dr. Frederick Stieve: "Im Dunkel der europeischen Geheim-diplomacy" (Berlin, 1926). The editor's purpose was undoubtedly to reach a larger reading public and to make incriminating evidence stand out more vividly, etc. "There is no commentary, beyond a brief seven pages of introduction. The documents are allowed to speak for themselves and it must be admitted that they tell a rather unedifying story of the statesman's Paris activities. (He speaks of Izvolski.) 'When all is said this correspondence still formulates the most serious indictment of Franco-Russian pre-war policy and lends

considerable colour to the theory that there was a conspiracy against the peace of the world."

In England, the British statesman, Lord Sydenham of Combe,[1] wrote in his recently published book, "My Working Life" (London), "That among all the surprises, exploded from the 'Pandora Box' of the Peace Treaties, I was most shocked by the inexplicably cruel maltreatment of Hungary by the Peace Conference . . . if any of our former enemies ever deserved a dignified human treatment . . . this country is Hungary. In the first place, Hungary was driven into the war against her wish and will, and certainly it was not her own fault not to be able to get out of it. . .And, in spite of these well known facts, the chief inquisitors of the Peace Conference dismembered that country of two-thirds of her pre-war territory. . . . Because of this unwise mutilation existence of Hungary today is fragile and full of troubles. As to Rumania, Serbia and Czecho-Slovakia, these countries have been tremendously enlarged by the Peace Treaties. These countries now try to manage dissatisfied masses of Hungarians awarded to them by the Treaties, a task beyond their strength. I look with real sympathies at this proud Nation of glorious past now so shrewdly inclosed by that 'well armed ring of the Little Entente, threatened in any moment by her neighbours, so far below the Hungarian culture. It is an unfathomable action on part of the great powers toward Hungary, the more, as it was well known by the powers that that country was murdered by Bela Kun, the representative of Soviet Russia and Lenin. Nobody can explain further the mission of General Smuts, who, arriving in Budapest, never left his railway car and left Budapest one or two hours after his arrival."

Professor G. Lowes Dickinson, of Cambridge University, England, wrote in "*International Anarchy, 1904-1914,*": "The inefficiency of the League of Nations produced Locarno. But even Locarno will have little meaning if the chief obstacles to peace, the Polish Corridor, the South of Tyrol, Silesia,

1 Lord Syndenham of Combe is a recognized authority on international questions. He served his country with distinction as Governor of Victoria and Bombay and has spent the greater part of his life in British politics.

Bessarabia, and most vital of all, the case of dismembered Hungary, are not settled. The peace of Europe will never be advanced by militaristic aims."

APPENDICES

General Harry Hill Bandholtz: An Undiplomatic Diary, New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.

[Editor's note: Brig. Gen. Bandholtz, was the American representative to the Inter-Allied Military Mission in Hungary between August, 1919 and February, 1920. The Mission's goal was the supervision of the Romanian military occupation of Hungary. His Diary was recently republished under ISBN 0-9665734-6-3.]

On September 29, 1919 Bandholtz wrote: "Colonel [Nathan] Horowitz, who is a member of the Committee on Army Organization and who had visited western Hungary, turned in a report on the general conditions there, and in particular concerning the Jewish persecutions. He stated that in his opinion Admiral Horthy's army had done everything within reason to prevent any such persecutions, and that he considered that no more atrocities had been committed than would ordinarily happen under the stress of such circumstances".

On November 18, Bandholtz continues: "As a matter fact, the arrests that were made were practically insignificant, and none were made that were not perfectly justifiable."

On December 22, 1919. Bandholtz wrote: "In the news summaries from Vienna, the *Arbeiter Zeitung* of the seventeenth of December, gave the Americans honorable mention, and among other things said:"

"An American Commission which visited Kecskemét found sixty-two corpses lying unburied and hanging on the trees of a neighboring forest. This paper is in position to prove by an official document that this wholesale murder was committed by order of the functionaries of the Hungarian state, with the knowledge of the highest authorities and of the Ministry of Justice, and that it was hushed up, though the number of victims is said to be about five thousand."

"The Allied Powers are about to conclude peace with this government of murderers and thus to receive them into the community of civilized humanity. The Roumanians kept these men in check, but hardly had they left when the slaughtering began. English, French, and Americans did not permit them to protect the lives of these miserable people. The American Colonel Yates undertakes the supreme control over the Brachialgewalt, that is, the new forces. Now, under the Stars and Stripes of the United States, who could hold back these monsters, the murderous work will go on."

"The above translation was sent me by Mr. Halstead, the American Commissioner in Austria, and immediately upon receipt I telegraphed as follows:"

"*Budapest, Hungary, 22nd December 1919*

Mr. Halstead,

Vienna.

B 225 Reference your Press Summary Number 81 your regrets about action of Vienna press apply particularly to article from Arbeiter Zeitung of December 17 quoted in your Press Summary Number 85. Every statement in this article as received and regarding Americans is false. No American Commission visited Kecskemét. Colonel Yates returned to his permanent duties in Roumania over three weeks ago. The American member of the Inter-Allied Military Mission was relieved from same on December 13. Report that Colonel Yates undertakes supreme control over the new forces and that murderous work is going on under the Stars and Stripes of the United States is inexpressibly false and libelous and it is requested that prompt and efficacious action be taken adequately to punish the perpetrators, to force the Arbeiter Zeitung to retract its false statements, and to prevent a repetition of such a scurrilous publication. B. 225. Bandholtz.

Before departing Budapest, General Bandholtz confronted Admiral Horthy on January 20th, 1920. He described it in his diary as follows: "then I told him that I was sure it would appeal to him as being advisable to be frank with me in regard to any Bolshevist uprising, or anything of the kind; that I had repeated and almost confirmed rumors of the killing of some Bolshevists at the Ganz-Danubius Works in Budapest, and of an incipient Bolshevist uprising at Szolnok. He appeared astonished at this information, and said positively that

he had never heard anything of the kind; furthermore, that he had just come from Szolnok within the past twenty-four hours. He then called in his Chief of Staff, who substantiated everything that the Admiral had said."

"The natural inference is that these persistent rumors of Bolshevist uprisings and killings in Hungary are due to unfriendly propaganda, but it is hard to tell just who starts it."

....

Charles à Court Repington: After The War, A Diary; Boston: Houghton - Miffin, 1922.

Foreword by Andrew L. Simon

Born into the British aristocracy, educated at Eton, served as a Lieutenant-Colonel in the British Army, sometime intelligence operative, British diplomat Charles à Court Repington was a keen observer of European politics during the early part of the twentieth century. After WW1, Repington's *Vestigia: Reminiscences of Peace and War* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1919) and his monumental two volume book *The First World War, 1914 - 1918: Personal Experiences* (London: Constable & Co. 1920; Boston: Houghton- Mifflin, 1921) made him a celebrated author throughout the world. In 1921 he traveled extensively throughout Europe, visiting all major capital cities. He met with kings and prime ministers, diplomats and political leaders in most European countries. His diary, written during these visits and published under the title *After the War*, (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1922) records his personal experiences, impressions and his conversations with many influential persons. In his Preface he outlined his reasons for writing the book:

"When the Peace Treaties, with one exception, were ratified and in full operation, I felt the need of a wander-year in order to acquaint myself with the new personalities and new ideas which the great war-storm had thrown up to the surface of affairs in continental Europe. It was useless to content oneself with archaic notions when all was changed, if one wished to keep abreast with the times, and there was no better way to discover what was happening than to go and see for oneself."

"A mission suggested to me by Viscount Burnham enabled me to carry out my wish under favourable conditions. To him, and to many other good friends at home and abroad, my thanks are due for their confidence, their hospitality, and their assistance. Later in the year the opportunity was presented of attending the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armaments. I

offer this diary as a small contribution to the knowledge of people and events in the world of to-day in the hope that it may aid my readers to judge for themselves the proper direction of foreign policy in the future."

Repington's unconditional support by the British diplomatic establishment in all European capitals suggests that he was more than a traveling writer of history books. He had a level of access to political and governmental leaders that suggests a roving British ambassador, rather than that of a well known and respected author. Commander of the Order of Sts. Michael & George.—a title usually given to British diplomats—, Commander of the Belgian Order of Leopold, Officer of the French Legion of Honour suggests a respected diplomatic background. Without doubt, he was an insider at the British Foreign Office. He spent a great effort in each country to assess the potentials of trade with Britain. According to his diary, he often reported to the British Foreign Office during his travels.His remarks and comments clearly demonstrate his deep insight into Europe's future political problems.

Only Chapter VII is included in this excerpt [pages 154 through 175]. It describes Repington's visit to Budapest between April 15 and 21, 1921:

7. THE SORROWS OF HUNGARY

Budapest, Friday, April 15, 1921. The Danube is a nobler river than the Moldau, but Budapest has a strong resemblance to Prague, with its heights and palaces on one bank and the lower part of the town on the other. Went up our Legation. Hohler has been and still is seriously ill with 'flu and bronchitis. Saw Athelstan-Johnson, the First Secretary, and looked over the Legation —I beg its pardon the Headquarters of the British High Commission[1] which has a beautiful view over the river from the heights close to the old cathedral. Very comparable with Sir Clerk's view from his terrace over Prague, but the Legation here is much smaller. A charming place of an old-word type with arched and vaulted roofs and an inner court. Left a card and note on Count Albert Apponyi who is away. Lunched with A.-J. in his house and we discussed European politics. He thinks that the old nobles party here is losing

1 The treaty of Trianon had not been ratified at the time.

ground, and that the various countries round hate each other too much to combine. He would approve of the final break-up of Austria, part going to Czechs and Serbs and part to Germany and Hungary. I said that I did not see the continued existence of Czecho-Slovakia on these terms and that Italy would not like Germany on her borders.

He told me that Lord Bertie's correspondence was lodged at Welbeck in two strong boxes and that it would not be published for fifty years. I asked if it included the private letters written to the Foreign Office and were they not very Rabelaisian? Yes, he said they were. Bertie had copies of them all, for he was a bureaucrat and had kept everything. I grumbled because we should never see these gems. A.-J. said that they were a most faithful and accurate representation of Bertie's time in Paris during the war.

Went on to see Brigadier-General Gorton, my old friend of past Intelligence days, now at the head of our Military Mission here. The French press seems to be quite off the rails in belittling the Little Entente and in boosting a Karl Kingdom here and in Austria. I am amazed that they seem quite off the Czechs. The Frenchmen ought to travel a bit and they would see how the land lay. I saw Mr. Barber of our Commercial Branch, Mr. Humphreys being away, and am to come in and gain a little trade wisdom from him tomorrow. Went to the opera with the Gortons at 6 P.M. A good house and a competent orchestra. "The Evening Star," by Meyerbeer. I have never heard it before. Very well done. Went on afterwards to dine at about 9.15 with the Gortons and General Bellini, the Italian Military Commissioner, and his wife. I asked the Italian General whether Italy's natural frontier on the Alps appeared to him worth the passing over of the Tyrol to Germany, as seemed to me likely to happen eventually. He thought it was worth even having Germany on the border for Italy to gain the natural frontier. Doubt whether Sforza will agree with this opinion. Am afraid that our own people at home are too much immersed in their Martha-like worries to understand where all this affair is leading. The abandonment of Austria is the beginning of a great future disturbance which will entail the ruin of the Benès scheme and of Czecho-Slovakia, and the eventual spread of German dominion over not only Austria, but Hungary, which is hard beset by Roumanians and Jugo-Slavs not to seek refuge in a German, or in fact in any combination which is against the Roumanians.

Saturday, April 16, 1921. A Hungarian Cabinet e which followed the Karl *Putsch* has resulted in the replacement of Dr. Gratz from the F.O. here and his replacement by Count Banffy Count Stefan Bethlen, aged about forty-eight, becomes Ministerpräsident, or P.M. I am told one effect of recent losses of territory by Hungary has to leave about fifty per cent of the present population Protestant with some affinity to the Wee Frees. This counts for the visit of the American and English Unitarians to Transylvania last autumn. The Magyars had shrieked about their treatment by the Roumanians. The parsons after a three months' tour gave the Roumanians a dressing-down, and said that it was like placing Mexicans over two million Americans. Had an innings with Barber about trade and commerce. He gave me interesting and relevant facts. I never realised before Hungary was now only one-third her former size and population; had lost all her mines, iron ore, forests, half of coal, headwaters, etc., and was reduced to the status of a large farm. Albert Apponyi recommends a waiting policy, sure that the peace is untenable, but also that no basis exists yet for modification. In fact - *pensons-y toujours!* Quite sound. Colonel Alfred Stead is specialising here in films, oil, river transport, banks, and other speculations, have a suspicion that the clauses about Danube navigation are the most sensible things in the Peace Treaties. They are the only things not demonstratively cursed by everybody. I must look into them. I am told that the Hungarians secretly do a night's drill a week. They can place 70,000 men in the field, but of course one cannot neglect their old war-trained veterans whom Gorton puts at 800,000 men. Pesth very full of officers in uniform. Not quite the old aristocratic-looking lot. Expect they are all pretty hard hit. Ministers here get the equivalent of thirty-six pounds a year.

Motored with Gorton up to the golf course on the Downs behind Buda. Fine air and views and a perfect mass of wild flowers of all sorts. The Gortons dined with me. He told me that the Archduke Joseph stayed on here all through the Bela Kun Bolshevist régime and called himself Joseph Anschut from the name of his country house. Joseph a regular Magyar and speaks the lingo. He is forty-eight. He means to call himself Lorraine instead of Habsburg as he is entitled to do by his descent from Maria Theresa. It would evade the proscription of the Habsburg, but Gorton tells him that the Allies might see through the plan. He is a tiptop shot and a fine sportsman. The Hungarian Habsburgs seem to have been little in touch with F. J.'s crowd. When F. J.[2] came here he stayed with the Andrássys, etc. When Karl came here to be crowned he scarcely left his railway train. G. says that the reverence of the

people is not for an individual, but for the sacred crown of St. Stephen. Last night at the opera the Archduchess occupied the Royal Box. Met the American Military Attaché Enslen and his wife. Nice people. One thing I must say for Francis Joseph. He was the greatest builder of towns in modern history. History will admit it if we do not.

Sunday, April 17, 1921. Wrote on Austria; then lunched with Mr. Davidson, of the *Chronicle*, and Mr. Dicker, of the *Chicago Daily News*. They have been about in this part of the world all the winter and were interesting. We are all agreed that the opening-up of all frontiers of the old Dual Monarchy is the only economic salvation for Austria and the Succession States. We walked down to St. Margaret's Island and had tea there. Athelstan-Johnson dined with me in the evening and we had a good chat and wrangle over Central European affairs. A capable man with strong and decided views.

Ex-Kaiser Karl is still King of Hungary and has never abdicated in this capacity. The Government is still the "Royal Hungarian Government" and uses the Royal Crown on its official paper which I have examined in order to make sure. The Governor Admiral Horthy[3] is a kind of Protector. In fact he is Regent. All who swore allegiance to Karl and the sacred crown of St. Stephen still adhere to him. If they did not -and some were away- they consider themselves free agents. The mass of the people are Monarchists, but do not want the King back just yet. Quite a number would like to elect a King. Joseph is much liked, but they say that there are other reasons why n many like to plunge in that direction. Albrecht is talked as a substitute. He is very rich, whereas poor Karl is said to be very broke. Still I would back Karl from belief the *"moriamur pro rege nostro"* 1741 sentiment of a by peasant people, and because one cannot get over the fact that he has been crowned. Why are my friends in Vienna, Mensdorff apart, backing Joseph? Why does not Austria like or wish for Karl? Is it from jealousy of Hungary? Perhaps it is all of scant practical import because all feel that the matter is not urgent. There is a King to be had if the people want one, but Karl is not a great figure, and he has done little to make Austria stand up for him, while in Hungary many think that

2 Repington refers to Emperor-King Francis Joseph. [Ed.]

3 See details in Adm. Nicholas Horthy: *Memoirs*, ISBN 0-9665734-3-9.

there is a period like our Commonwealth to be got over before a Restoration. There is so much else to be done first! All the same the Hungarians seem to be so deeply incensed against Roumania, which now bullies two million Magyars in Transylvania, that they will join any combination against her which promises success, and they might want a King then.

I don't much care for all the reports here against Roumania. She is said to be rotten, everybody bribed, no governing personnel fit to run her new territory, railway hopeless for military and commercial uses, etc., and altogether a very sorry story of graft, incompetence, and peculation. Not good when Germany must have such a grudge against her and the Hungarians are always ready for any mischief on her borders.

It is also very enlightening to study here the new map of Hungary and to size up her losses under the Trianon Treaty. Especially to note that all the headwaters of her rivers are cut off from her to the north and east and the foresters in the north unable now to float down their logs to Budapest. One peasant of Tlemcen was asked how he got on under the Czechs. He said that when the Vag ran to Prague upstream instead of to Budapest, it might be all right. Population, mines, forests, salt, iron, the grain of the Banat, and much more all taken away. A peace of justice? How can the Magyars think it?

Monday, April 18, 1921. The *Corriere* correspondent here came to talk. Lunched with Captain Thomas Domaille in charge here of the Danube Navigation Company, run by Furness's house in London, chiefly by Sir F. Lewis, and by Cox's Bank through Eric Hambro. The Fleet consists of the D.D.O.G. (Austrian) and M.F.T.R. (Hungarian) fleets on the river, of which fifty per cent were annexed by Roumania and Serbia, who say that Paris can decide what they like about the ships, but they are not going to give them back. The fifty per cent remaining, now the Company's, include fifty-six steamers, sixty-eight tugs, seven hundred barges, and eleven motor barges with a total personnel of some six thousand people. D. is keen about taking over and improving the Mannheim-Regensburg Canal. This is little used now, and only three feet deep, but a million would make it fit to take the D.N. Company's barges, and they could then ascend the Rhine and pass by the Canal to the Danube and deliver a ton of steel at Budapest at twenty-seven shillings a ton. The other way costs forty-five shillings a ton up from Galatz alone. It is energetic of England to have got hold of the Company, but I doubt that it more than barely pays its way yet. The Regensburg scheme offers great

possibilities. A great fault in the International control of the Danube is that one set of men look after the actual navigation, and another after dams and agriculture. it is a fault because everything done to the banks, etc., affects navigation, rate of current, fall of water, and so on. The Danube is a five-knot stream; the Rhine, they affirm, only one to one and one-half knots.[4] So it is much easier to ascend or tug up the Rhine than the Danube. I doubt whether the Danube Commission in Paris is much good. The riparian States play tricks as they please.

Spent the afternoon in studying agricultural facts statistics. Much hampered by want of figures since Peace; all statistics are for the old Hungary. The All the great Hungarian basin or lowlands, has lost all timber by the recent partition; i.e., about six and a million hectares out of seven and a half; much of its livestock and its fodder, twenty-four per cent of its horned cattle, thirty per cent of its sheep, and forty per cent of horses, half of its coal supplies, and 128,000,000 out 144,000,000 of tons of its iron ore. All its salt supplies gone, all its gold, silver, lead, copper, zinc, quicksilver, antimony, cobalt, nickel, and aluminum mines, and natural gas. The splitting-up of a hydrographically united economic whole is especially fatal to Hungary. The problem of water power will now be difficult of solution, irrigation most precarious. The sources of energy and reservoirs should be, and now are not, in the same hands as the territory to be watered. The new arrangement is handing over the Assuan Dam to the dervishes. The Vág (Waag), Tisza, and Maros can only carry their timber the timberless Lowlands, and are not allowed to do so now. The tobacco factories and sugar refineries in the mountains will also languish, as their raw materials come from Lowlands. The appeal of the Hungarian Geographic Society to the world is, to my mind, one of the strong arguments against the recent so-called settlement. But what settlement, here or elsewhere, was ever made but by force?

The chief agricultural products of Hungary are whet, rye, oats, and spring barley. Potatoes are widely grown, and clover and lucerne among the fodder plants. Wheat is the chief product of the Alföld. Maize is a big crop. So is sugar beet. That remarkable publication, the *Magyarország Gazdasági Térképekben*,

4 Quite incorrect. The Rhine stream between Mainz and Coblenz is at eight knots an hour.

or *Economics of Hungary* (1920), shows in a series of maps in the most striking manner the loss to Hungary by the settlement in every class of crop and industry. It is painful reading. I wonder if the victors at Paris will allocate those forty million saplings to the afforestation of the barren tracts that the Hungarians used to do. What will happen to the Forestry High School[5] at Selmeczbánya? I wonder how the extensive irrigation system will get on when it has been broken into by the new boundaries. But the more one looks round one in this part of the world, the more one wonders and at last one ceases to wonder, for one's capacity for wonder becomes exhausted. Don't know whether the world has been made safe for democracy, but am sure that democracy has shown itself unsafe for the Austro-Hungarian world.

I have seen figures which show that large estates under the intensive farming system, compared with the small estates, often produce double the crops. Deep steam ploughing in the autumn, frequent hoeing, good manuring, a proper rotation of crops, adequate capital (sometimes), and efficient management are the main causes. Many of these large estates will soon pass into the hands of the small farmers under the Agricultural Reform Act, so it is unsafe to speculate on the results.

Nemesis is evidently reaching the selfish Succession States too. I hear on all sides that they are losing by their protectionist tariffs.

Two good stories at dinner to-night. One, the receipt of a letter by the Hungarian Government from the League of Nations requesting them to establish a sanitary cordon on the Polish frontier to prevent the spread of typhus. The fact that there is no such frontier is not yet known at Geneva. The other, an F.O.[6] letter refusing to send petrol to Budapest, but saying that a lorry would be sent out via Trieste and that it could travel backwards and forwards from Budapest to Bucharest for supplies which, they believed, were available there. A rough calculation showed that the journey to Bucharest and back was one thousand miles or nearly as far as from Budapest to London. I

5 [College of Mining and Forestry. ALS]

6 [British Foreign Office. ALS]

wished that Henry Labouchere had been alive and in diplomacy here to answer that letter. He would have made the F.O. squirm.

Tuesday, April 19, 1921. Went off to the Parliament hear Count Stefan Biathlon announce the new Government's policy. A huge and uncommonly late Gothic pile, the central part with a dome too narrow at the base, and most well-arranged inside. Had a front seat in the diplomatic box. Three tiers of public galleries, quite full except behind the Presidential Chair where there is only one tier all round the house. I should say some two thousand of the public could find places. The horseshoe system of talking-shop with tribune and president's desk. The Ministers sat in the front row of the horseshoe facing the tribune. Good light and air. Bethlen was speaking when I arrived and he spoke for about an hour. His wife, an attractive lady, in a gallery on my left. B. rather like Lord Lansdowne twenty years ago. He spoke clearly, his notes in his left hand, and using the other for gestures mainly up and down as if he were hammering in nails. A strong Calvinist, without the agile flexibility of Teleki, and wanting in the sense of humour. Captain Rapaics, the High Commission liaison officer, translated for me when there were important points in the speech. The chief things seemed to be that the whole Parliament was in unison, that it would take three years to carry out legislation already proposed, that the question of a King was not yet safe to discuss, and so forth, ending up with a quotation from Lord Salisbury about strong and weak nations.

I saw the P.M. in his private room after his speech, and afterwards saw Count Andrássy, Count Albert Apponyi, Mr. Czabo[7], the head of the Small Holders' Party, prince Windischgrätz, Count Pallavicini, Mr. de Bárczy, and several others, and had good talks with them all. I liked the look of the members. They resemble what our House of Commons used to be twenty-five years ago. I asked them how it was they managed to get such a nice lot of members out of universal suffrage, and they said that formerly Budapest had sent its carpet-baggers round to be elected, but that Bela Kun's Bolshevist rule had so disgusted the people that they had all elected their own natural chiefs locally. I liked Bethlen. He is going to give me a paper for publication with his views. We had a brief talk of affairs. Czabo farms thirty-five acres. He does not talk

7 [Most likely Istvan Nagyatadi-Szabo. ALS]

any language but Hungarian, though I believe he reads French. We had a little talk through de Barczy, who has the curious post of sort of permanent secretary to Prime Ministers, and is a sort of Chief Whip as well. A young man, alert, and capable. Czabo is a good peasant type, squarely built, medium height. Wearing high boots to the knee, crinkly at the top. He controls the largest party in the house, namely, the Small Holders' Party, which has some eighty-six members. We had some talk of the agricultural and irrigational consequences of the Peace Treaty. He is Minister of Agriculture. He is popular, though Pallavicini grumbles that he is a trifle Bolshie.

Count Julius Andrassy is getting on in years now, but these Magyars wear well, and both he and Count Albert Apponyi, who is seventy-five, are very spare, hale, and hearty. Andrassy is an interesting figure. He told me how he had always loved and admired England, and how deeply disappointed he and others had been that England had deserted her old principles and had put her name to such an act of injustice as the Trianon Treaty. Hungary had never hated England all through the war; since the Peace her sentiments had changed, but it was not the England that Hungary used to know that had made the Peace. Windischgratz told me that it was his grandfather who had made the famous remark that "no one counts below the rank of a baron." It seems to be the other way about now.

Bethlen was well received by all the House. They seem a very united Parliament. I am found fault with when I call them Conservative. I can believe that they often get too excited and interruptious. The House was built for a larger body than the present members. They used to be 413 and now are little over 200. The number of empty benches is a perpetual reminder of Hungary's loss. The House of Magnates still exists to the north of the Parliament House, but is not in being. Feeling is more or less liberal when not quite democratic, I am told, and the continuance of a House of Lords is regarded as an anachronism. But a Second House or Senate is to be created, probably on a basis of county representation. Many are for proportional representation in order to secure the middle classes adequate voice in affairs. The Houses suspended the sitting for about a quarter of an hour when Biathlon sat down, and then I had a talk with him on the general results of the Treaty, but he was soon called back to the House. I did not see Kovács who is said to be the brain of the Farmers' Party. All these figures might easily be duplicated by members of our House of Commons. They all talk English except the peasants. The Magyars have marched with the times, but it is odd to find a Windischgrätz an

advanced radical! Generally speaking, the oldest noble families are losing ground somewhat, and it is the Bethlens and the Telekis who are coming to the front. A critical, interested, and very attentive House. Ditto the public in the galleries. Lunched with the Gortons; the Greek Minister and his English wife; the Roumanian Military Attaché and First Secretary; Mr. Athelstan-Johnson; Mr. Robinson, the English Consul here; the American Military Attaché and his wife, and a Spanish diplomatist. A nice garden on a terrace at the back of the house looking over the river.

I was amused to hear that the Roumanian Minister had not got a house yet, and that the Military Attaché had only a room some 2x2 metres for a bedroom and office. They had purchased a house, but the tenant refused to turn out, and it is most difficult to put one out under the present laws. The Magyars detest the Roumanians on account of their looting during the occupation following the Béla Kun régime. They rejoiced at their arrival, but the Roumanians really came in order to treat Hungary as they had been treated by Germany. They are accused of having stolen everything moveable plate, pictures, carpets, linen, furniture, even down to the cloth off billiard tables. They took the best thoroughbreds and let them die in the train for want of food. They took twelve hundred locomotives and left the Hungarians only four hundred. In my hotel Bela Kun had done five million crowns' worth of damage. The Roumanians did seven millions worth. They took literally everything, and the rooms are still without telephones as a result of their brigandage. This, of course, is all the Hungarian account of what happened. The other side of the story must be heard in Roumania.

The Roumanian Military Attaché, by name Margaretezen, or some such, tells me that he is followed by three agents and cannot go anywhere without his movements being reported. He gives the Magyars a bigger force than most people, and two hundred and fifty guns. He thinks that the country is stiff with rifles, and declares that German equipments keep on flowing in. He does not believe that when the Reparations people come here they will discover much, for the watch-posts stop travellers everywhere and communicate with their friends when anything has to be concealed. The American thinks that this is all exaggerated, but admits 600,000 men capable of being mobilised if arms, guns, and equipment are here for them. I saw Hohler after lunch. A pretty sick man still and was only in an armchair for an hour or two before returning to bed. He is fully of opinion that great injustice has been done to the Magyars under the Treaty, and we had a good talk over it all. He gave me a

note to the Finance Minister Hegedüs. A capable representative, and I wish I could have found him fit and well.

Went on later to the F.O. and saw Count Banffy, the new Foreign Minister, who was very courteous and interesting. I told him that I found a difficulty in describing what the Government here was, for there was nothing quite like it anywhere else. Whitaker's description of it as a Republic seemed incorrect when they called themselves a Royal Hungarian Government, but I was not sure whether to describe it as a Monarchy in suspense, or what. Banffy said that the meaning of the Crown of St. Stephen to the Magyars could not be understood except by Magyars. Every single Magyar was a member of this Crown, and regarded it as the sanction of his personal rights and liberty. The Golden Bull was only a few years after Runnymede, and the development of Hungarian life and political thought, except for the one hundred and fifty years of Turkish domination, had followed English lines. English constitutional history was well known here and our political precedents were frequently quoted in Parliament when they had none of their own.

It was true that Károlyi had declared a Republic in 1918, but in March, 1919, the Bolshevist reign of Béla Kun had begun, and to this succeeded a Governor, now Admiral Horthy, who was much what Cromwell was in England in his day. The feeling of the whole country was undoubtedly monarchical, but it was realised that considerations relating to foreign policy made it highly inconvenient to raise the question now. Why had not Karl understood this? I asked. He said that the facts were not yet all fully known, but that the whole history of this affair would eventually be set down. No one knew of his coming. Perhaps he had expected support in various matters. In any case B. said, that every Hungarian had done his duty and that the Government had given Europe proofs of its good-will and of its desire not to disturb the Peace.

He said that if Benès opened his campaign for freeing the customs within the old Empire, Hungary would be with him, but that Hungary's great difficulty was the millions of Magyars annexed to the neighbouring countries, and the incessant complaints of ill-usage which they brought back with them. Scarcely a day passed without the return of refugees with these stories, and the result was that opinion in Hungary was so incensed that it would be difficult to make Parliament accept any economic agreement that did not take into full account the interests of these unfortunate Magyar minorities. Who looked after them now? I asked, and why was it left to Scottish and American

Unitarians to represent the hardships of these people? The Allies had forced the Treaty on Hungary, and it seemed to me their duty to control the execution of it. Yes, said B., but after the ratification he presumed it would be the League of Nations. This question of the four million Hungarians in the neighbouring States evidently gave him great concern and will affect his foreign policy very much. I told him that I thought Benès was ready for accommodation. Without it I doubt that Bánffy can go far. The Magyars are a chivalrous, warm-hearted people who will always support their unfortunate fellow-countrymen.

We had a talk about the other effects of the Treaty and B. confirmed all my opinions of it. I also gather that. Sir George Clerk's intervention here was most happy when all was in disarray. Clerk told them they were not divided on any essential matters and that they should have a coalition Government and get on at once. They seem to have followed the advice exactly, and it all worked out, though not fully till the Socialists were put out and the present lot came in.

I talked for an hour with Bánffy on these and other matters, and went on to see Count Albert Apponyi with whom I stayed till nearly eight discussing the general situation. He tells me that he is an independent and has not joined any party. He is Karlist. He watches events. He says that the main result of the war has been to change completely the mentality and outlook of all people. The masses, who fought the war, and expended so much blood, courage, and fortitude, now look for compensation to a larger share in the Government, and Apponyi is prepared to support them. They have lost faith in the old leading circles who brought about all their sorrows. He was biting about the ignorance of the Peacemakers of all the conditions of Eastern Europe. They had to be shown the positions of the largest towns. He, with Teleki, Bethlen, Hegedüs, etc., were in Paris. He had found that they were given no opportunity of explaining their views, so had written to the Big Four, and finally was allowed to explain the situation on the express understanding that there should be no discussion. He spoke in French and then in English. Lloyd George seemed struck by his remark that particular blocks of Magyars had been violently and unnecessarily detached from Hungary, although they were physically in contact with her. L. G. had passed a note to Clemenceau and afterwards had asked for further explanation and had brought out his ethnographical map. He had heard from an English friend that L. G. had trounced his staff for the treatment of the Hungarians, but unfortunately

nothing had been changed. The injustice remained. A. thought that the Treaty could not stand, but they had intention of doing anything to upset Europe. It is pathetic how all these Magyars confide in the legendary justice England and in her power to put matters right. I tell them all that the mass of our people were too much preoccupied with affairs more vital to them to worry about little Hungary, and that I felt sure that few outside the official classes knew of the measure meted out to her and what all implied.

Wednesday, April 20, 1921. Hegedüs, the Minister Finance, is the financial magician of Hungary and either be described hereafter as a genius or a lunatic, I do know which. I went to see him this morning on introduction. I found a deputation with him demanding higher salaries. He told them that he had doubled their purchasing power by raising the crown from 2200 to 1000 for the pound sterling and that this was his system and would do no more. A man of devouring energy, rapid thought, and torrential speech. He has, in fact, raised crown as he says, and hopes to raise it to 500. This is our English comparison; actually these foreigners' standard value is usually the Swiss franc, and the crown is compared with the number of centimes that it is worth in the Swiss money, but it is all one. He has stopped the printing paper notes, and contemplates the destruction of masses of them still in circulation. He is dead against foreign loans. He is the apostle of self-help. How does he work?

He regards every taxpayer as a congenital liar and so shuns valuations and income-tax returns. He thinks direct taxes useless because so much is paid in kind for work done, and the values cannot then be appraised. He does not like inquisitions and knows that Hungary is not accustomed to them. He goes to work a different way. He increases the indirect taxes, and incidentally mentioned a new tax on cigarettes which would bring in several millions. He taxes the war profiteer by taxing him double amounts on all increases since 1914. He takes for the Government a first mortgage of twenty per cent on all houses. Here the value has to be stated, but if the value of a house is understated he may buy it, and sell it again. He calls upon all companies of whatever kind to increase their share capital by fifteen per cent. He takes these new shares and sells them back to the companies if they want them, and if not, then in the open market, or keeps them and his mortgages as securities to use for any purpose. This avoids all question of prying into capital and profits. He takes twenty per cent of all moneys on deposit in the banks. He proposes to take two, three, or four years' annual rent from all estates except the large ones as a capital levy on them, and if he cannot discover the amount of the rent he

judges by the nearest farm from which figures are available. From large estates he takes twenty per cent of the land and sells it to peasants and small farmers, thus making an agrarian law of his own; and from all these sources he reduces his deficit, which he found when he came in, of twelve milliards by seven milliards, and proposes to cover the remaining five milliards deficit by an internal loan. He has a foreign debt which he places at 130 milliards, and thinks that as he is the debtor of France and England these countries will give him time, say ten years, as France has already undertaken to do, to pay the debt. Before that time he hopes to have re-established Hungary's financial stability and to have brought back the crown nearly to the pre-war parity. The payment of foreign debt will not then cost the country what it would cost to pay it now.

He thought the Treaty, when he first read it, not bad but good, because it was so bad that it could not endure. Had it been better it would have been worse. He has passed twelve out of some twenty-one Bills which complete his programme, and if he gets through his capital levy and agrarian schemes he thinks that the whole programme will be completed. It is coming up to-day. Much depends on what he is asked to do about reparations. He hopes that his efforts to restore Hungary's credit without appeals for help may be taken into consideration, and that a fair amount of Hungary's debt may allocated to the Succession States which have annexed the territories and populations. He is against what he calls the morphinisation of a country by foreign loans. He tries to copy English finance, and by copying England and America in stopping the printing of notes he hopes to advance in time to their standards in exchange. He is most ardently in favour of free trade in the Succession States and says that England ought to help as she can sell nothing to them at the present rates of exchange. He is furious with Roumania for allowing no letters to go from Hungary to Magyars now in Transylvania, and says that his relatives and friends are constantly returning, as they find themselves unable to endure Roumanian rule from its cruelties, exactions, and corruption. He says that the Hungarians are the only race in Europe who are neither Slavs, Germans, nor Latins, and would hope that we should extend our protection to them. He amused me by saying that the first thing he looked at in the morning was not the state of the exchange, but the meteorological reports. The recent slight rain, he said, meant milliards to him. We had forty-two days of drought before it came.

Whatever the result of all these schemes may be, it must certainly be admitted that Hungary is facing her difficulties bravely and helping herself. It is only to be hoped that the reparation people when they come here will not be such a great expense to this little country as they have been elsewhere, or try to exact payments from a people who are trying to avoid appeals to Europe. The best reparation is to allow Hungary to recover economically and then trade.

Alfred Stead came in late and told me much about his efforts to galvanise British trade into life again. He too is doing something and is one of the few Englishmen really working here. He gave me his views about the future of the Danube. Dined with the Greek Minister and his wife.

An interesting visit and am sorry that it is so short, as there is much more that I should like to have seen and done here. The real obstacle to progress in this part of the world is the racial rivalry of all these people, who are all embittered by the war, while the vanquished are still more embittered by the Peace and by the loss of so many of their people by the transfers of territory. All the same I find that Austria and Hungary are ready in principle for free trade and I think it was a pity that free trade within the old Empire was not enforced at the Peace. I expect that I shall find more objections to sensible economics in Roumania, Jugo-Slavia, and perhaps Bulgaria than I find in Prague, Vienna, and Budapest. I think that we should reconsider our attitude to Hungary. It seems to me that Hungary, Jugo-Slavia, and the Czechs are the strong people in these parts, and I doubt from all accounts whether Roumania will prove any serious barrier against Bolshevism if a barrier be needed. Hungary, I think, will, and all except Jugo-Slavia are horribly afraid of her. Her martial reputation has survived defeat. Altogether Central Europe is full of fascinating problems, but one must keep a more or less open mind till one has visited Bucharest, Sofia, and Belgrade. Then one can conclude.

*Thursday, April 21,*1921, As there was no direct train to Vienna to-day, I made a virtue of necessity, started dawn, and made a long detour through Hungary round Lake Balaton and so to Vienna by 7 P.M. Very glad have seen this country and to have gained this bird's view of Hungary's wealth. The crops looking better the few days of light rain. A general air of content. The black soil looks amazingly rich. Flocks of sheep, large droves of pigs, plenty of horses and cattle, extensive vineyards, much beekeeping, and any amount of farmyard fowls. The houses well-built and looked comfortable. Usually single-storied, brick and tile. Balaton of length and fair breadth. Hardly any

coal on the railway: the stations had piles of wood. Went to the Imperial again, and managed to get dressed in time to dine with Sir William Goode at the Bristol, where I found a party of a dozen men, largely Americans, including General Churchill, U.S.A., Walker D. Hines, just back from looking into the division of enemy Danubian shipping, American Chargé d'Affaires, and a few Austrians, like Police President Schober and the clever doctor who has done so much for the Vienna children.

I was glad to see Schober again and told him that there were a few things I wanted still to know from him, especially the value of his police and the gendarmerie, and composition of the crowds which painted Vienna red every night. Were they foreign or Viennese? He thought that his police were very trustworthy, and that he had control. The gendarmerie in the Provinces were some nine thousand and were also good. The so-called Army was no good at all. Why not abolish it and increase the police forces? Schober said that it was a Socialist toy. They came to him privately and admitted that it was useless, but publicly they had to support it. Schober wished that Austria might be allowed to have Militia service with compulsion. So, no doubt, would Germany. I then asked him about the night life of Vienna, and told him how it had disgusted many people in view of Vienna's food condition. I had heard various explanations given, what was the right one? He said that Vienna, like all great capitals, catered for public wants. Vienna had always laid herself out to entertain her visitors and did so still. He had made a number of perquisitions, i.e., raids, on the various night haunts and had found that ninety per cent of the people attending there were foreigners, and that the remaining ten per cent were the new rich, largely Jew, and not four per cent real Viennese.

Mr. Hines a thoroughly capable American with a judicial turn of mind. He thinks that the riparian States will accept his decision about the ships. The real trouble is the frontier question. The Danube is only in principle free. Also the trade is mainly up from Galatz and not down. But he thinks that there will be a big surplus of wheat soon, and that if coal were sent out at that moment the emptied barges could take coal up the river. He and the American Chargé d'Affaires were most bitter about France who, they say, will soon be cordially detested everywhere. The French Government, or at least their Minister here, had committed a folly in protesting here against the *Anschluss* Vote in the Tyrol, and had declared that the Reparations Commission would resume its work and credits be withheld, but as everybody here knows that Goode is

winding up and going away next week, and that there are no credits, this leaves the Austrian Government cold. The result of this folly, to which we weakly adhered, has been to give an immense fillip to the Pan-German Party, and there had been a big meeting at Vienna and the French had been hissed. I think the English too, and there is going to be another meeting. This is all exactly contrary to the suggestions[8] which I sent to Lord Burnham, for I told him that the movement were better not taken tragically and were best ignored, as it was platonic and the Government here were quite sound. But now public feeling has been aroused. It is difficult to cope with such light-headed policy.

There was a British officer present who was shortly going to Budapest on the military control to look into Hungarian armaments, to see the Trianon Treaty ratified. He asked for my views. I told him that if there were arms and so on they would have been concealed long ago, and he would find nothing: also that I did not think it was any disadvantage to us if Hungary were strong. In any case she is entitled to the Armistice scale until the lapse of a certain period after the Ratification. Goode said that the Americans here all knew my views and had read my last book. He had intended to dine with me alone, but the Americans had insisted upon coming to meet me. Several of them offered to help me in every possible way. I told Hines that the Americans would have to come into European politics again, for we could not do the Atlas business much longer[9]. We were too small a country and our internal difficulties were too great. If the Americans did not come in things might begin to crumble. Under the rule of demagogues and agitators who put the nose of our F.O. out of joint, we could not control affairs abroad, and they must see how their own trade was being paralysed. They were much interested in the financial policy of Hegedüs. But I can never recall his name. I can't get nearer to it than Habakkuk.

Vienna, Friday, April 22, 1921. With great difficulty got a ticket to Paris and a sleeper. Wrote a first article on Hungary. Wet and cold.

8 [Another indication that Repington was actually a British governmental representative sent to assess the political situation. ALS]

9 [An accutate forcast of the impending decline of the British Empire. ALS]

Saturday, April 23, 1921. In the train for two days and a night bound for Paris. Met an intelligent Director of an Anglo-Austrian Bank. We agreed that Central Europe had not thrown up any man of distinction except in Czecho-Slovakia, and that the inability of the Austrian Government to impose its will on the Provinces was a very serious matter. Met also an educated better-class Pole, one the many foreigners I have met lately who are travelling for American firms, not to do business, but to watch and report events so that the United States may be ready for any business going. The state of the exchange practically prohibits business. Many of the traders have suffered heavily because they have not protected themselves properly in their contracts against the practice of Eastern Europe to refuse to pay until the exchange improves. The United States are flooding Eastern Europe with their travellers and expert observers, and they choose foreigners of some position probably on account of the general American ignorance of foreign tongues, and because they find it necessary to deal with leading people who will not talk to the ordinary trade traveller. My belief is that we shall need to make a great effort to prevent Germany, with her depreciated exchange, from dominating all these markets after reparations are finally regulated.

....

Graham Hutton: Danubian Destiny, A Survey After Munich; London: George Harrap & Co.,1939

Foreword by Andrew L. Simon

Holder of a degree in economics and one in law, Graham Hutton, a retired Assistant Editor of *The Economist,* has traveled throughout Central Europe before and during the Munich Crisis. His earlier books were *Nations and the Economic Crisis* and *Is It Peace?- a Study in Foreign Affairs*. His third book, *Danubian Destiny* is a detailed political and economic analysis of the countries in the Danube basin in the eve of W.W.2.

Preface by Graham Hutton

In 1886 a young Englishman, son of Joseph Chamberlain, was sent to Paris by his family, to prepare for a career in public affairs. One day, at the Ecole des Sciences Politiques, he heard the lecturer on diplomatic history, Albert Sorel, make this pronouncement: "On the day when the Turkish question is settled Europe will be confronted with a new problem that of the future of the Austro-Hungarian Empire." But what perturbed young Austen Chamberlain was not the possibility that the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy might collapse and its dominions disintegrate. It was that Sorel went on to draw a conclusion most discomfiting to any thinking Englishman. The young man, destined to be Foreign Secretary of his country, heard the French professor describe the disintegration of Austria-Hungary as a possible preliminary to the break-up of the British Empire.

Sir Austen Chamberlain said that he never forgot Sorel's warning. The former Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom was not happy about the disruption of the Austro-Hungarian political and economic unity, sanctioned by the victorious Allies in the Peace Treaties. He became towards the close of his life increasingly unhappy about the future of maimed and lamed Austria, threatened by Germany's Third Reich. But, perhaps fortunately, he did not live to see what happened to Europe in 1938. For then what his French professor had feared half a century earlier came to pass. The last vestiges of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the small independent states reared on its ruins

and in its place, collapsed before two short and sharp German diplomatic assaults.

On the face of it, Englishmen may possibly still wonder as no doubt young Austen Chamberlain wondered in i886 what influence a break-up on the Danube can exert on British, or even European, destinies. But Austen Chamberlain, the student of international affairs, saw the importance of Danubia to England fifty years ago; and his last speeches to the Commons in 1937 were warnings of what might befall Britain if Germany became heir to all the Habsburg's empire, and more besides.

This book is an endeavour to discover to what extent the Third Reich, after peaceful and spectacular victories in 1938, can mould Europe's destinies. Those victories were gained in Central Europe, the gateway to the Balkans, Russia, and the Near East. Henceforth Germany has little to fear militarily from her disrupted and disarrayed small neighbours on the farther side of the Rome-Berlin Axis. What profit the governors of the enlarged Reich can draw from that tract of country which we call 'Europe beyond Germany' must be estimated. What they can do with it and what they will do may be two very different things. But we cannot even begin to guess what they will do before we know how the entire European setting has been altered, how the disposition of European forces and resources has been changed, by German achievements in the Danubian Basin during 1938.

Accordingly this book must begin by setting out the accomplished facts. Their significance for good or ill must then be estimated. Such an inquiry must be undertaken dispassionately, even if we have to reckon with terrible and moving contingencies. If what Nazi Germany will do lies beyond the bounds of reasonable reckoning, what her rulers can do lies well within the bounds of calm conjecture. It is our business first to determine what they can do. After that the conclusions of author and reader may differ; and they may alike be falsified by the greatest of all imponderables in history the hand of destiny.

The leading motif of this book is that a new Europe is being moulded on the farther side of the Rome-Berlin front: that from Danubian destiny will come European destiny. It may be peace or war, welfare or ill-fare. The best-laid schemes of dictators and democrats may alike go agley. But what transpires beyond the Rhine and the Alps is now bound to decide what happens to all Europeans. Nations can, of course, contract out of war; but they cannot

contract out of a common destiny. And it is a common destiny which now confronts all nations in Europe.

GRAHAM HUTTON, January 1939

.....

Pages 197 - 199 from *Danubian Destiny*

....Hungarians are not in love with the Nazis. The Magyars fought the Austrians in the middle of last century, and thereafter gained the right to rule, from Budapest, the larger part of the Habsburg dominions. The foundering of Austria in March 1938 brought Prussian rule to Vienna as well as to the confines of Hungary. The dismemberment of the Hungarians "one foe, one hate," Czecho-Slovakia, within six months unloosed acute mistrust in every Magyar breast save those of the Hungarian Fascists. The latter are a very small minority of the proud, independent, individualistic Magyar folk. Their influence is least strong in the Army which has always been a strong political cement in Hungary and Nazi demands are more likely to be made direct to the Government than indirectly by trying to overthrow it.

There is no people in Europe as strongly individualistic as the Hungarian, and the stratification of Hungary's social system is as like that of England as the Hungarian Constitution and limited monarchy is like the English equivalents. (Perhaps that is why the English and Hungarian versions of 'democracy ' less essentially democratic than those of other liberal regimes in Europe have been more successful than those of the German Weimar Republic, France, Czecho-Slovakia, Belgium. For both England and Hungary, with their vestigial aristocracy, their rigidly defined class and caste barriers which every one voluntarily respects, thereby gain in national cohesion.) In Hungary too, then, the enlarged Third Reich finds, as in rump Czecho-Slovakia, another small folk on its present periphery a people not willing to be tyrannized; a grudging collaborator in peace, but a formidable blackmailer and rebel in time of war. To secure Hungary's wheat, cattle, poultry, fruit, in peacetime, when other countries leave to the Reich a free field there, is easy. To ensure increased supplies of these things in war-time, and to ensure that over 1,000,000 Magyars will in fact march with Germany, may require an occupation of the centre of the Danubian Basin which will be extremely costly as costly in money as it will assuredly be in men.

Hungary to-day has no defences against Germany; she is the only truly non-Slav neighbour on Germany's eastern or south-eastern borders; she might easily be made to do German bidding, might easily be bankrupted or overrun if she did not. But once she has done German bidding to regain her Magyar souls and territories from Rumania and Jugoslavia, once she has Magyar lands and a united or undiluted Magyar population, she may prove to be a formidable and intractable neighbour. In this connection we do well to recall that when Magyar overlords and Slav or Roman subjects were at daggers drawn before the breakdown of the Habsburg monarchy there was no common enemy. Russia, which the Teutonic Austrians in Vienna most feared, was the friend and Great Father of all Austria-Hungary's Slavs. To-day it might be neither surprising nor difficult for Magyar and Slav in South-eastern Europe to put their heads, their trade, their hands, together. And secretly the Italians might be glad to see that happen.

One thing alone is sure: the Hungarians may be prepared in future, as in the recent past, to do a little military free-booting on their own revisionist account; but they loathe and fear the prospect revealed, so soon after their 1918 tragedy, of being once again embroiled in a general European war between the Great Powers. They are a small, poor, defenceless, but proud and defiant people. Their national hymn epitomizes the tragedy of their position in history and geography alike: "Lord, remember this people, who have suffered enough in the past to atone for all the future!" As individuals they are the best of friends; as a people, the worst of neighbours. Only one man really got the better of Bismarck, and he was a Magyar, Count Andrássy.

....

John Flournoy Montgomery: HUNGARY: THE UNWILLING SATELLITE, New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1947

Foreword by Andrew L. Simon

Between 1933 and 1941 the United States' minister to Hungary was J. F. Montgomery. In 1947, when the Soviet occupation of Hungary, consequently the Moscow-imposed Communist rule appeared to be inevitable, he wrote this book about his experiences. In the followings the first thirty pages are reproduced[10].

Preface by J. F. Montgomery

The statement in George Washington's farewell address that: "The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest," is less frequently quoted than his warning against the entangling of "our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rival-ship, interest, humor or caprice." Yet though it be true that our first President could hardly foresee our international commitments as the strongest world power, his statement concerning "habitual hatred" and "habitual fondness" is at present even more timely than in our nation's childhood.

10 *Hungary: the Unwilling Satellite* was republished in 1993 by Vista Books: ISBN 0-9628422-1-4

Habitual hatred and fondness have done us immense harm, and they are just now the gravest threat to our peace and security. Hatred and fondness are emotions, not concepts. Hence to foster them harmonizes well with the thought that Americans cannot be asked to sacrifice their lives and fortunes save for ideals. Millions of my compatriots are wont to proclaim this doctrine with ostentatious self-esteem. Yet I venture to say that one could cite no surer evidence of our political immaturity.

A foreigner, whom I know as a keen observer of Churchill's and Roosevelt's foreign policies, once remarked to me that obviously the British could be led into war whereas the Americans must be maneuvered. This was not flattering and I was inclined to resent it. However, sincere self-examination may oblige us to find some truth in that verdict. Our stature is that of an adult, even a giant, but we are comparatively new in international relations, and therefore, our mental attitude in this field is more often than not that of an adolescent.

Afraid of being called cynics, most people do not desire to admit the truth that in default of a law-enforcing agency, international law is virtually nonexistent and the relations of sovereign states are, in general, such as hold between gangsters dominated by interests, not by sentiments. The idea that we are just now on the threshold of a better era is refuted by the fact that the second World War has immensely increased the power of the most perfectly totalitarian nation.

As a nation advances, it becomes increasingly aware that it is profitable to take other nations interests into consideration. This is but an improved way of defending and promoting one's own interests; it does not change the nature of international affairs.

Do not believe that the United States took part in two world wars just to live up to its ideals. The United States entered into both these wars to defend its vital interests. It may be said that in doing so it misjudged its interests. It may be said that it failed to protect them. These objections are open to discussion, but the fact remains that America took part in these wars for the utterly material reason that England's defeat would have jeopardized America's safety and prosperity. This, rightly or wrongly, was America's real motive.

We are not the only nation which feels that it must have its wars idealized. The old battle cries of "For God, For King, For Country!" were more truthful than

our modern slogans, but even in those times the war lords found it advisable to fill their soldiers with the belief that God was with them and against the enemy. Riding the wave of miraculous progress, our age has substituted doctrines for deity.

It can readily be understood why we Americans have gone to such lengths to hide our interests in idealistic wrappings. Our experience in international relations is naturally much shorter than that of the Old World. Just as a horse, coming from an endless line of ancestors, need not be taught which herb is healthy and which one is poisonous, peoples of the Old World know almost instinctively the limits of terms like “alliance,” “enemy,” “oppression” or “peace.” They know that beauty is relative to the beholder's eye; while we are still believers in the absolute. They have oppressed others and been oppressed. They have been the aggressors and the attacked. They have fought with everyone and against everyone. They are skeptical; we are still gullible. They realize that, knowing little of the past and less of the present, men know nothing of the future. We think that we are masters of our destiny. This faith is a source of strength but also of great error. He who looks too far ahead may easily stumble.

We shall not be on an equal footing with Old World nations until we acquire their sense of relativity. Hence our so-called idealists are the worst enemies of our national success. They blindfold us. They are responsible Churchill’s and Roosevelt’s foreign policies, once remarked to me that obviously the British could be led into war whereas the Americans must be maneuvered. This was not flattering and I was inclined to resent it. However, sincere self-examination may oblige us to find some truth in that verdict. Our stature is that of an adult, even a giant, but we are comparatively new in international relations, and therefore, our mental attitude in this field is more often than not that of an adolescent.

Afraid of being called cynics, most people do not desire to admit the truth that in default of a law-enforcing agency, international law is virtually nonexistent and the relations of sovereign states are, in general, such as hold between gangsters—dominated by interests, not by sentiments. The idea that we are just now on the threshold of a better era is refuted by the fact that the second World War has immensely increased the power of the most perfectly totalitarian nation.

As a nation advances, it becomes increasingly aware that it is profitable to take other nations interests into consideration. This is but an improved way of defending and promoting one's own interests; it does not change the nature of international affairs.

Do not believe that the United States took part in two world wars just to live up to its ideals. The United States entered into both these wars to defend its vital interests. It may be said that in doing so it misjudged its interests. It may be said that it failed to protect them. These objections are open to discussion, but the fact remains that America took part in these wars for the utterly material reason that England's defeat would have jeopardized America's safety and prosperity. This, rightly or wrongly, was America's real motive.

We are not the only nation which feels that it must have its wars idealized. The old battle cries of "For God, For King, For Country!" were more truthful than our modern slogans, but even in those times the war lords found it advisable to fill their soldiers with the belief that God was with them and against the enemy. Riding the wave of miraculous progress, our age has substituted doctrines for deity.

It can readily be understood why we Americans have gone to such lengths to hide our interests in idealistic wrappings. Our experience in international relations is naturally much shorter than that of the Old World. Just as a horse, coming from an endless line of ancestors, need not be taught which herb is healthy and which one is poisonous, peoples of the Old World know almost instinctively the limits of terms like "alliance," "enemy," "oppression" or "peace." They know that beauty is relative to the beholder's eye; while we are still believers in the absolute. They have oppressed others and been oppressed. They have been the aggressors and the attacked. They have fought with everyone and against everyone. They are skeptical; we are still gullible. They realize that, knowing little of the past and less of the present, men know nothing of the future. We think that we are masters of our destiny. This faith is a source of strength but also of great error. He who looks too far ahead may easily stumble.

We shall not be on an equal footing with Old World nations until we acquire their sense of relativity. Hence our so-called idealists are the worst enemies of our national success. They blindfold us. They are responsible for our losing the peace after winning the war. They are the manufacturers of habitual

hatred and habitual fondness. They make our diplomacy rigid and unadoptable.

As businessmen we know that co-operation need not be based on personal friendship; nor need we hate our competitor. We know that he is not necessarily a wrongdoer. In his way he may be right, just as we are right in our way. Our interests clash, that is all. As a nation we are still lacking this wisdom.

When, after the first World War, American and British scholars began to reveal that the war guilt had by no means been one-sided, our approach to their writings was chiefly emotional. Had we been a mature people, we should have been able to say: "Perhaps we were not crusaders after all, but we fought on the right side anyway, because we defended our interests." I admit that every nation would find it hard to attain that measure of aloofness. But even a slight admixture of it to our diplomacy would have sufficed to produce a more intelligent peace than the one patched up in the suburbs of Paris.

Convinced that we had fought on the side of the angels, we not only allowed our allies to put in practice the secret treaties they had withheld from our knowledge; we even made ourselves the champions of some of their most destructive designs. To top all that, we let them prescribe for us on which nations we had to bestow our habitual hatred and on which nations our habitual fondness.

The first World War, like the second one, was a struggle between two coalitions. I believe that not many Americans have ever considered that within a coalition there may be defenders of a bad cause along with defenders of a good one. Yet it is a general truth. He who fights against a coalition might easily be fighting on the wrong side and at the same time on the right side. This is not a reflection for generals, but it ought to be one for peacemakers.

We know now that, as the English historian G. P. Gooch put it, "the First War was an East European quarrel. Germany was dragged in by Austria; England and France by Russia." In other words, if we want to establish the original war guilt, we have first to consider the responsibilities of Russia and Austria-Hungary, whose respective allies were not given much choice. There is little doubt that Russia was more imperialistic than the Danubian monarchy, which had been on the defense against modern nationalism ever since the French Revolution.

To us, the first war appeared primarily as a conflict between Germany and our allies in western Europe because it was there that our troops fought. Austria-Hungary to us was a German satellite, and the part played by Russian autocracy was soon and conveniently forgotten. We were not burdened with knowledge of eastern European history and snatched gratefully the simple formulae offered by foreign propagandists. Since Germany was the enemy, Germany was wrong; since Germany was wrong, her Austro-Hungarian ally was wrong too. Since Russia was about to quit, why bother with her? France, Italy, England and Japan were certainly right.

Am I exaggerating? I do not think so. When Hitler began to make himself the heir of the Hapsburgs, Americans began to wake up. Since then I have been told by innumerable individuals that we should not have destroyed the old Austria "but what else could we do?" they add. By way of justification they cite the "fact" that the Danubian empire was "ramshackle": It would not have held together anyway because, they say, modern nationalism had rendered it obsolete. Had we not been so informed by Hungarian, Slovak, Croat, Czech, Italian, Rumanian and even German-Austrian nationalists among our immigrants and visitors? If all of them had the same complaint, was that not sufficient proof? It did not occur to these Americans that the complaint might prove merely that no matter how ramshackle in appearance, the empire had kept any one of these races from chaining the others. Once the empire was dissolved these nations did not want its restoration. Americans do not seem to be aware that the most fervent longing of modern nationalists is not for freedom but for mastery. Austria-Hungary seemed ramshackle to Americans. Russia, just as heterogeneous as she, did not, because the czars, more reactionary than the Hapsburgs, had kept their subjects illiterate.

Making good use of our impression that we had participated in a principally Western conflict, our allies and associates laid down for us laws of habitual hatred and fondness concerning eastern Europe. We responded by being obedient and trustful, like draft oxen under the yoke. The English and French had already developed the conception of Latin-Slavic co-operation against non-Slavs and non-Latins. The German-Austrians and the Magyars were neither Slavic nor Latin. Hence these two were treated as vanquished and guilty while the Slavs of Austria-Hungary were nominated victors, although with exceedingly few exceptions they had defended the Hapsburg empire for four and a half years with no less fervor and tenacity than had the others. We Americans were ordered to love Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Yugoslavia and

to applaud the ill-treatment meted out to Hungarians and German-Austrians. We did. We bowed reverently to the fact that one racially mixed community, Austria-Hungary, was replaced and absorbed by a number of states, three of which, namely Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Rumania, were no less mixed than the dissected empire had been, whereas two states, Hungary and German-speaking Austria, suffered amputation of their best provinces.

I say we bowed to this settlement. To be quite exact, we did not care. The limited attention we gave to Europe hardly crossed the Rhine. If it suited the British and French to put millions of German-Austrians and Hungarians under Czech rule, Hungarians under Rumanian, and Croats under Serbian domination, why should we be squeamish?

But having helped our allies to win, we had our share of responsibility in the results of victory. We should not have washed our hands of all the injustice committed in the name of national self-determination, and yet we did. The fact that others, nearer to the spot, were no wiser than we may exculpate us, but it does not mean that we acted wisely. Peace treaties involve recognition of new factors that have been introduced by war; they also should involve a consulting together on the part of all the belligerents as to how best to set the world in working order again. Our desire to dictate the peace deprived us of much needed advice and criticism from experts among the countries most affected.

Even before Hitler shocked us into realizing our blunders, the truth had dawned upon some Americans who visited the dismembered empire. Businessmen, having visited first Croatia and then Serbia, or first Transylvania and then old Rumania, would ask me in bewilderment why advanced races had been put under the rule of comparatively backward ones. I could not find a satisfactory answer. Apparently in 1919 Christian statesmen had not yet discovered as we now seem to have discovered a method of chasing millions of provisionless people over the border without the slightest regard for family ties.

It is amazing how endurable have been those habitual hatreds and fondness produced in the first World War and then foisted on us by our allies. The explanation is propaganda an amount of propaganda unthinkable at the time of Washington's warning. People deprived of their livelihood by their neighbors never even had a hearing. At the same time, those who profited by

the victors arbitrary discrimination showered us with an unceasing flow of propaganda. Especially does this refer to the Czechs, who took some of the best agricultural parts of Hungary and the richest industrial parts of German-speaking Austria. Many millions of dollars were spent every year in various kinds of propaganda the object of which was to keep what had been seized.

All of this may sound like past history, outrun by events of incomparable magnitude. In reality it is living history. The same habitual hatreds and fond-nesses are still alive and have already begun to shackle us and to make us blind to our own interests. I am not speaking of Germany and Japan, although these are cases where a policy of permanent hatred would be the source of most fateful blundering. I am speaking of the eastern half of Europe which includes one half of central Europe.

Again, as in 1919, we are asked to consider the Slavs our natural friends and the non-Slavs our natural enemies. But Slavism now means something quite different from what it meant after the other war. Then it referred to small and separate nations, to Poles, Czechs and Serbs. Now it refers to the largest continuous empire on earth, which, controlled by a dictator, stretches from the Pacific Ocean into the heart of Germany, having reduced to the position of satellites all the Slavic races which had not been under the scepter of the czars all Poland, Bohemia, Slovakia, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia and Bulgaria. At the same time, we are expected to contribute, at least by acquiescence, to the chaining of those elements in the Soviet sphere which are non-Slav, principally Hungary, Rumania and German-speaking Austria.

With great foresight, Russian, Czech and southern Slav-communist propagandists, drawing from seemingly inexhaustible funds, prepared the ground for this policy before the second World War ended in Europe. A shrewd distinction has been dinned into our ears a distinction between Hitler's victims and his collaborators and satellites. How many Americans remember that Dr. Edouard Benes was swept out of office as president of Czechoslovakia by an irresistible wave of pro-German collaborationism which even rotted his own National Socialist Party, whose champions, Beran and Chvalkovsky, he had nominated as premier and foreign minister? How many remember that the Slovaks, described for twenty years as members of the one Czechoslovak race, sided with Hitler in his war against Russia and declared war on Poland and America? Very few, it is safe to say. But everyone seems to

believe that “feudal and fascist Hungary” was Hitler’s enthusiastic ally. Again, few remember that the Moscow Declaration, signed by us in 1943, reminded Austria, Hitler's first victim, of her responsibility in having participated in the war. The labels “victim,” “collaborator” and “satellite” have even been interchangeable. As long as it suited Moscow, Bulgaria was called a satellite of Hitler. When she became a satellite of Russia, it was acknowledged that she had been Hitler's victim. The same happened to Croatia.

It is not the purpose of this book to offer new objects of fondness or hatred. I am not asking anyone to like Hungarians and German-speaking Austrians and to despise Czechs, Croats and Serbs. Events to come may compel us to accept such an about-face in self-interest. But the less emotionally we act, the better we shall fare.

I have known many of these different races and ethnic groups and have found all to have attractive and charming traits. I reserve my own aversion for narrow-minded, boisterous, intolerant jingoes, whether they speak Rumanian, Czech, German, Hungarian, Serbian, or any other tongue. In this I hope the reader will join me. It is best to reject the master race mania wherever it is met, and it is not confined to any one country. First of all, it is well to recognize that much so-called leftism is simply camouflaged nationalism.

Ethnic democracy, that is, racial equality within a country, is more important than democratic elections and cannot be replaced. by the latter. Soviet Russia’s habit of calling herself a democracy will perhaps compel us to discontinue the use of this term. As long as we do use it, it must not mislead us.

Many people think that it is useless to protest if one is face to face with accomplished facts that cannot be changed without another world war. My reply is that facts are really accomplished only when recognized as permanent, and that to consider another world war as the only remedy is to put into practice a defeatism which is not yet warranted.

Having been United States Minister to Hungary from 1933 to 1941, my regular post of observation in those critical years was Budapest. It was a unique post because the Magyars, neither Teuton nor Slav, were always aware of being between the two fires of German and Russian imperialism. During

those years, most of us saw only one fire, the German one. Hungary's vision was far ahead of ours. Had we listened to Hungarian statesmen, we should perhaps have been able to limit Stalin's triumph in the hour of Hitler's fall.

Hungary, between the two wars, was a small country, and from my watchtower on the Danube my eyes could roam over her neighbors and neighbors neighbors, over Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Germany and Italy. The Department of State encouraged my travel across many borders. Anticipating what I want to show in this book, I might say that what I witnessed was a tragic and insoluble conflict between fear and honor, in which fear was bound to win. It is an undeniable fact that on many occasions those who had been treated as stepchildren by the Western powers in 1919 showed more loyalty to the Allied cause than their spoiled favorites did.

Would it not have been better if we had opposed the arbitrary discrimination indulged in by the surgeons of 1919, who thereby afforded Hitler his most powerful arguments? Offered a second chance, we ought to set ourselves strongly and firmly against a repetition which this time would allow Slavic imperialism to run amuck.

J. F. Montgomery, August 1947

.....

The Prewar Line-up in Central Europe

WHEN I looked down for the first time from the Fishermen's Bastion next to the Coronation Church on Castle Hill in Buda, I thought of what another envoy, Otto von Bismarck, had written to his wife in 1852 when he was in Buda on a special mission for the King of Prussia:

"The Emperor was so gracious as to offer me quarters in his castle, and here I am sitting in a large, vaulted hail at the open window into which enter the peals of the evening bells down in Pest. The view is enchanting. The castle towers high on the hill. When I look down, there is first the Danube, over-arched by the Chain Bridge; then follows the city of Pest, and behind it there stretches the endless plain, vanishing hazily in the blue-red evening vapor. To the left of Pest, my eyes can wander upstream; on its right bank, the

Danube is first hemmed by the city of Buda, and then there are mountains, blue, bluer, finally brown-red in the glowing evening sky. In the middle of the two cities, there is the broad mirror of water, broken by the Chain Bridge and a wooded island. If only you were here for a moment to see with me the dead silver of the Danube, the dark mountains against the pale-red background and the lights of Pest glittering up to me; Vienna would go down in your appreciation compared with Buda Pest. You see, I am a worshipper of natural beauty. Now I must appease my stirred blood with a cup of tea. I don t know where I got that song that does not leave me alone today: 'Over the blue mountain, over the white seafoam, come thou beloved one, come to thy lonely home."

This nostalgic song he quoted in English. No doubt Bismarck was enthralled by the irresistible charms of the Hungarian siren. I could easily share his emotions. It is undeniable that European city builders on the whole have made use of the favors of nature more successfully than we Americans, and of this the twin cities of Buda and Pest were an outstanding example.

I say "were" instead of "are" and I do so with a heavy heart. Today the outlook from the Fishermen's Bastion is not fascinating but saddening. The Royal Palace where Bismarck wrote that letter is in shambles, the Coronation Church is gutted. All six bridges have gone, and with them the lovely Széchényi Chain Bridge. Margaret Island is devastated and the Corso, scene of mirth, grace and elegance, is no more. Eleven weeks of fighting, preceded by air bombardments, transformed many districts, rich and poor, into deserts of wreckage and rubble. Worst of all, hunger still stalks the capital of an agricultural country in which, before the Russians looted it, not even the destitute had lacked for daily bread.

Having known Hungary before the catastrophe, I have suffered an irreparable loss. Yet I am grateful that I was allowed to have a last glance at a great achievement to which the Western world owed a good deal of its security, alas, without acknowledging its debt. When we look at the map and find Europe a tiny appendix of the Asiatic mainland, we cannot help admiring the courage and tenacity of those who, through the centuries, prevented the submersion of Europe. One of the outposts holding out against immense pressure were the Magyars, though they had come from Asia themselves.

I saw Hungary in peace, but I cannot say that I saw her in normal times. “Normalcy” ended in 1914, and what was left of Hungary after the first World War was but a shadow of herself. As a result of Hitler's rise to power in 1933 Budapest had suddenly attained great importance on the international chessboard, and when I was asked to go there as American minister, I accepted my mission with eager expectation.

Before going there in July, 1933, I spent thirty days of preparatory study in the State Department and learned that while Hungary was a puppet of Italy and had no independence of action, she was of importance as a listening post. Italy had left the peace conferences of the suburbs of Paris dissatisfied after the first World War. For that reason she became the chief antagonist of France and those who had participated in the distribution of Europe, that is, Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania and Czechoslovakia, who naturally agreed with France's policy of anti-revisionism. Those who had lost by the treaties of Versailles and Trianon naturally leaned toward Italy. The Germans did so rather reluctantly because they were playing for higher stakes and had a poor opinion of Italy's strength and ultimate reliability. The Austrians, on the other hand, regarded Italy as an anti-revisionist power because she refused to disgorge Southern Tyrol which had been taken from Austria. Only the Hungarians could look to Italy wholeheartedly as there was no clash of interests. Italy wanted revision at the expense of Yugoslavia, a member of the Little Entente, whose chief, and sometimes it seemed sole, aim was to keep Hungary under strict control.

Between Rome and Budapest there was common ground, but subsequent events proved that it is not true that Hungary was an Italian vassal. The idea that Hungary’s policy was solely determined by Rome is a gross mistake. In foreign affairs, nothing is more alluring and more misleading than oversimplification. Not for a moment did the Hungarians renounce their right to make their own decisions of course, within the limitations of a small, unarmed power. For a time, they were pretty well tied up with Italy because there was nothing else to do, but with the rise of Germany, this situation changed. Up to the time when Germany and Italy were pushed together by the force of events, Hungary could and did balance herself between the two. If Italy wanted her to do something she did not want to do, she told them that she could not because of Germany; and if Germany wanted her to do something she did not want to do, she told them the same thing about Italy. This policy in the hands of a clever diplomat like Kálmán de Kánya gave

Hungary, during most of the time that I was there, considerable liberty of action.

The nations on the European continent, including Russia, recognized the danger of Nazi Germany sooner than England or the United States. The general reaction was fear. In strong countries and in those which considered themselves strong, that fear was adulterated by hope of profit through the approaching turn of events. The Soviets regarded Hitler as their icebreaker who would destroy democracy, prosperity and freedom to their final advantage. Mussolini, overrating Italy's position and his own skill, thought that he would remain the senior partner in the new adventure. But France and the minor nations around Germany were subject to unadulterated fear. While England and America talked of peace, they commenced to think about war, and it became plain that the alternative was subjugation.

If England kept aloof, there seemed to be no need for any foreign policy. If there was to be a new war between the great powers, the supreme task of every weak country was to remain neutral, if possible. Apart from that, the most important thing was to be on the winning side. Who of the small neutral nations wanted Germany to win? It can be said with certainty that until June of 1941, when Germany attacked Russia, none of them wanted a German victory. There was good reason to believe that not even Mussolini wanted Hitler's victory to be complete. All the nations of Europe knew that a German triumph would mark the end of their sovereignty, but at this point we must distinguish between nations that had been the beneficiaries of the first World War and naturally were afraid of German success which would not only deprive them of their territorial gains but even of their sovereignty; and nations that had been ill-treated by the peace stipulations and found it more difficult to make up their minds. It is true that the latter preferred independence and narrow frontiers to dependence and wider ones, but at the same time they feared a German victory. To become dependent on Germany would be a hard fate. Yet, since Germany seemed to be invincible, they could not court complete disaster by openly opposing her. On the other hand, it was the natural instinct of the profiteers of the first World War openly to oppose Germany.

The whole picture was finally blurred by the German invasion of Russia. That happened after I left Hungary, but it was not unexpected. It was apparent that it was only a matter of time before the two tyrants would be at each other's

throats. Russian communism is practically the same system as German national socialism. As they used to say in Budapest, the only difference between Nazism and Bolshevism is that it is colder in Russia. Both envisioned world conquest and were not only perfectly ruthless, but used the same methods. Americans, being farther from Russia and more or less blinded by their hate of Hitlerism, did not share this point of view with Europeans. This accounts for the fact that we did not make greater efforts to prevent pan-Slavism from succeeding pan-Germanism. The people of central and eastern Europe I knew only too well that if the Germans were locusts, the Russians were super-locusts, impoverished by a planned economy which had put guns before butter, not since 1933, but since 1917.

It is, therefore, surprising that the Hungarians sympathized with the cause of the Allies to such a great extent as they did. It is undeniable that they did not act receive encouragement from the democracies. We did not promise them anything, we only threatened. Yet,with stout hearts and great political wisdom, they clung to the tradition of belonging to the Christian this civilization of the Occident although they seemed to be destined for the un-Christian civilization of the Orient.

It is an undeniable fact that Hitler's best collaborators in the second World War were the Czechs, the Slovaks and the Rumanians. Hungary held out longest against German demands, indeed, until the spring of 1944. Foreign propaganda, however, supported by our OWI, succeeded in distorting historic facts by telling our public that the regimes in Bohemia, Slovakia and Rumania were not representative of their peoples wishes whereas the Hungarian regime was. This allegation is highly questionable. Dr. Hacha, who surrendered Czechoslovakia, was constitutionally elected president after the resignation of Dr. Benes, who sent his congratulations upon the election. Father Tiso, the head of Slovakia, certainly enjoyed the adherence of the majority of his Catholic peasantry. In Rumania, the regime of King Carol and Marshal Antonescu was not what you would call democratic, but the movement which had swept it into power had been genuinely Rumanian. If, for argument's sake, we say that Hacha, Tiso and Antonescu were less representative than Horthy, would it justify the conclusion that Hungary's limited collaboration was more blameworthy than the unlimited collaboration of the others? If we accept the view that nations are not responsible for the actions of puppet regimes but are responsible for those of representative governments, then we should really prefer abject rather than

partial surrender to tyrants. It sounds absurd, but at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam, this preference was adopted as the policy of the major powers, including the United States of America.

Hungary's So-Called Feudalism

An American author and radio commentator recently explained to a friend of mine why the Russian occupation of Hungary was a very salutary event. "You know," he said, "Hungarian landowners are entitled to kill their serfs." This commentator had never set foot on Hungarian soil, but there was no doubt in his mind as to the truth of this statement. Stories about feudal Hungary were planted incessantly after the first World War in order to calm the world's conscience, which was a little troubled by the fact that in the name of national self-determination, more than three million Magyars had been put under Czech, Rumanian and Serbian rule. Now their feudal lords could no longer chop off their heads.

Feudalism is historically the medieval European system based on the relation of vassals and lords, arising from the holding of land in feud. Since feudalism is tied up with absolute monarchy, it is often forgotten that the crown and the lords were natural antagonists. The lords—or barons—could increase their prerogatives only at the expense of the crown. In the resulting struggle the crown often came to be allied with the common people against the nobility. Yet the net result was that the nobles were the champions of political liberties because the rights they won for themselves were afterward claimed by the common man. In the Holy Roman Empire the nobles were very successful in wresting concessions from the imperial crown. The Hungarian magnates never attained a similar position: In a small country the crown can assert itself more effectively. In the Holy Roman Empire the lords were for a long time the only politically vocal stratum of society; but the magnates in Hungary which never belonged to the Roman Empire were exposed to strong pressure from below, exerted by a very broad layer of minor nobles, the so-called gentry, which resembled the squirearchy of England and played a similar part in public affairs. Hence, unless we stretch political terms until they are completely disfigured, Hungary was never a feudal polity.

Hungary had a badly balanced distribution of its arable land. Many magnates owned large estates which were legally entailed and could neither be sold nor mortgaged. According to Hungarian official statements which I have usually found reliable, quoted by Victor Bator in the *Hungarian Observer* of November 19, 1944, about three-quarters of all landholders owned in 1935 about one-tenth of the land. This sounds less startling when compared with Denmark, where "68% of all agricultural holdings under ten hectares (the hectare being equivalent to nearly two and a half acres) account for 11% of the land," and with Holland where "13.6% of the land is held by 61% of the proprietors." Bator writes:

"The true picture concerning big properties in Hungary is as follows: the arabic area (including pasture land) is 13,142,122 yokes, that is 7,556,650 hectares. Out of this 1,225,325 hectares constitute the area of holdings of more than 575 hectares which are owned by private individuals and by the Church. This is 15.2% of the arabic land. . . . It is pure misrepresentation to state that half or more than one-third of the land is owned by a few hundred landowners. Actually the area of large estates in private ownership is 1,530,000 hectares, that is, 14% of the arabic land."

These figures show that the term "feudal Hungary" is, to say the least, highly exaggerated. To them should be added the following reflections: Extravagant ownership of the soil by aristocratic families would render a country feudal only if that ownership involved economic and political power. It did in Hungary before World War I, because agricultural products could be sold at a profit within the customs barriers of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the Hapsburg kings of Hungary preferred the aristocrats often foreigners who had received their titles for service rendered to the dynasty to the gentry, or simple noblemen. Whereas the aristocrats very often were on the side of the dynasty against the national interest, the nobles, who were descendants of the original conquerors of Hungary, identified themselves with the national cause. All this changed after the first World War. The aristocrats had invested their money lavishly in war loans which were entirely worthless after the defeat. The ruthless dissection of the old empire deprived them of their markets. In addition, with the rest of agricultural Europe, Hungary suffered because of the low prices brought about by the mechanization of North and South American farming. The effect on the aristocratic landowners was worse than on their untitled fellow sufferers because they were unable to sell or mortgage their entailed property. No longer propped up by the crown, the aristocrats saw

their political influence dwindle after the first World War. Furthermore, they lost their most traditional profession, that of service in the armed forces. Hungary was allowed only a token army and the proud Hussar regiments, which had covered themselves with military glory for five centuries, lay buried under the ruins of the old monarchy.

The gentry took possession of Hungary after the fall of the Hapsburgs. By the time I was appointed there, in July 1933, the aristocrats had little or no political importance. I do not consider that the transition from aristocratic leadership to gentry and civil service rule was necessarily a blessing for either Hungary or her neighbors. I have mentioned that the Hapsburgs preferred the magnates, or titled noblemen, to the gentry. Franz Josef knew that in a multiracial empire surrounded by hostile neighbors, the most valuable elements were those who, owing to their upbringing and international family connections, stood above nationalism. The gentry have had a double function in Hungarian history a positive one in keeping the nation alive and conscious of itself, and a negative one in being ultra-nationalistic. Thus they partly created the dangers against which they had to struggle.

Many people think that the existence of the Upper House, the House of Magnates, was sufficient to warrant Hungary being called a feudal country. When I was in Budapest, the Upper House was composed of the four Hungarian Hapsburgs, the two Keepers of the Crown, the supreme judges, the prelates and supreme dignitaries of the churches, the president of the National Bank, thirty-eight high aristocrats elected by their peers, seventy-six men designated by the counties and municipal cities, thirty-six representatives of the chambers of agriculture, industry, commerce, lawyers, notaries, universities, Heroes Order, Academy of Science and the stock exchange, forty lifelong members nominated by the Regent, one physician, one industrialist and one agriculturalist. It can be seen from the that the aristocrats were in the small minority. Great Britain retains the sediments of feudalism by preserving the right of the king to create new peerages on the advice of his government. In Hungary the Regent was not entitled to bestow nobilities and, therefore, the vanishing of aristocratic influence became quite patent. Count Stephen Bethlen, prime minister during the first decade without a king, had no estates and did not represent the supposed interests of his class. Count Teleki, though equally a member of one of the oldest families, was also estate-less, a quiet, soft-spoken scientist, by no means fitting the pattern of feudal lordship.

All that was left of economic feudalism was in many cases a brilliant front which covered indebtedness, if not outright poverty. The attitude of the Hungarian toward money was that its only function is to be spent. Hungarian hospitality was something proverbial in Europe. The Hungarian gentleman generally lived beyond his income, but he always entertained some way or other, even if it meant coffee and roll dinners for him during the following week.

Thus palaces built in the great day of the nobles and magnates had been equipped with tremendous reception rooms and ballrooms on a par with those in the Waldorf Astoria. These were not, of course, permanent homes; when it came to bedrooms most of them hadonly one; but as the owner of one of them remarked, forty people could sleep in it. Likewise, they had only one bath, if any. The distribution of space between entertaining quarters and living quarters in these Budapest palaces is a true indication of the accent the average Hungarian puts on entertaining. There were, of course, a number of permanent homes, with lots of bedrooms, in Budapest; but most of the well-equipped homes were in the country.

Some of the Budapest palaces were still occupied by their owners while we were there, though most of them were for rent. No one could figure out how the servants in these palaces were paid. One nice thing about entertaining in Budapest was that you could get all the trained butlers and footmen you wanted, for despite their impoverishment noblemen always had more servants than they needed and were glad to offer their services.

The custom of tipping in Hungary far surpassed the American brand. For example, when you rode in the elevator of a building, you owed the operator twenty centimes. If by any chance you did not pay him, he would follow you out into the street, if necessary, to collect it. When you went into anyone's home and gave up your hat, you were supposed to pay a pengö to the maid for its return. If you were a dinner guest, you owed considerably more, depending on your financial status. You paid this money when you got your coat and hat to go home. The money thus received was split up by the household staff, everyone getting his particular share. It naturally followed that the most sought-after positions were in the homes of those who were continually entertaining. No one ever complained about the number of guests you had.

Labor conditions in Hungary have been badly misrepresented in America. Industrial labor was organized in Hungary preceding the first World War and had obtained by the time I arrived there a similar status to that of American labor gained through the New Deal. Nevertheless, relationships between management and labor, especially in smaller enterprises, had retained some of its paternal characteristics, which frankly I would not consider a disadvantage.

While industrial labor enjoyed in Hungary all the social security which a poor country could afford to provide, the situation was very different with agricultural labor. First of all, the major part of agricultural labor was not unionized and health and old-age insurance were granted them only to a very small degree. Real poverty could be observed among agricultural labor mainly because there were not enough jobs for them.

Accusations of Hungarian feudalism often arose abroad because these questions were handled in an antiquated paternal fashion leaving too much leeway to the individual landowner, who was considered responsible for agricultural labor within his domain. Agricultural labor usually concluded contracts with the landowners on a yearly basis, which gave them more security, but on the other hand their salaries were paid to a large extent in kind, which meant that in bad years they earned less than they would if working on a wage basis.

The general spirit of the Hungarian employer was certainly not anti-labor. When, after the conclusion of the Trianon Treaty, living Conditions became bad and jobs hard to find, the landowners voluntarily put a considerable part of their agricultural machinery out of use in order to provide more jobs to manual labor. This rule prevailed while I was in Hungary. Although it was self-imposed with the idea of helping labor, it was a shortsighted policy based upon a misapprehension common in America also that the more people who do the job the better.

The relationship between employer and employee differed from anything we know in America unless we hark back to early plantation life in that the employer had to supply everything in the way of clothes, laundry and payment of doctors and dentists bills, not only for the worker himself, but for his whole family. The employer was the banker. If anything happened and the worker's family needed money, he naturally came to his employer for help, and he got it with no strings attached.

If you hire anyone in the United States, no matter how many years he works for you, you are free to discharge him if he does something deserving such treatment. Not so in Hungary. It was a very difficult proposition to dismiss a worker in Hungary, no matter what he had done, without making some provision for his future. We had a gardener who did nothing but dress up and sit in front of the house. His wife did all the work. We complained vigorously to the landlord. Finally he got us another gardener but he could not discharge the first one; he simply transferred him to his country estate.

Some of the Hapsburgs themselves were impoverished by the claims of their employees. Archduke Frederick, who had been commander in chief of the Austro-Hungarian armies, was, before the first World War, the richest man in the Hapsburg realm. At the time I was in Hungary, he still had about forty thousand acres of land. When Austria and Czechoslovakia expropriated his huge palaces and estates and the famous art gallery which he owned in Vienna, they discharged all his employees. These went back to Hungary, where the archduke, very honorably, considered it his duty to support them. For this immense burden even his large estate could not earn enough. Yet in his will he bound his heirs to keep on supporting this mass of dependents — even though he must have known that they could only end in bankruptcy.

.....